The Forum.

OCTOBER, 1891.

AN ENGLISH ESTIMATE OF LOWELL.

THE immortals of this generation are rapidly passing away, and as yet we see no others whose intellectual stature leads us to hope that they will take the place of the few who stand in the front rank. In England, Tennyson still stands supreme in the domain of literature, and no living poet approaches his greatness; and in the domain of politics, Mr. Gladstone still upholds the fame of his marvellous powers at the great age of eighty-two. But Robert Browning, with all his unequalled versatility, and Shaksperian insight into the human soul, has joined "the more in number," and has left the world much poorer. And Carlyle has gone, leaving behind him the sad legacy of records in which there were few of his contemporaries whom he has not branded with insulting epigrams. And "George Eliot" has gone, leaving us no chance, apparently, of ever reading another "Romola" or "Silas Marner." And Matthew Arnold — that bright and genial spirit whom to know was to love — has been called away. And though Mr. Ruskin still lives, his long silence and his broken health make it probable that we have received the last magic word-pictures of that enchanting pen.

America has lost Longfellow, who was as dear to England as to his native land, and under whose bust, glimmering at the corner of the south transept of Westminster Abbey, thousands pause with a sigh of regret for the loss of a life stainless as that white marble. And Emerson has gone, after bequeathing to us in prose and verse many a thought

Copyright, 1890, by the Forum Publishing Company.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which startles us like a flash of light in the darkness. And Wendell Phillips is dead, whose oratory at its greatest, like that of Pericles,

ἤστραπτ', ἐβρόντα, συνεκύκα τὴν Ἑλλάδα.

Two poets, indeed, remain in America, whose works the world will not willingly let die,—Dr. Oliver Wendell Holmes, whose *curiosa felicitas* and whose genial charm have delighted us for so many years; and Mr. John Greenleaf Whittier, whose Quaker righteousness, like the oratory of John Bright, often glows with such splendid indignation, because he hates cruelty and oppression with a hatred commensurate with the depth of his love for all that is tender and true. And among historians Mr. Parkman still remains. But, when these are called away, who will be left to maintain the full glories of English literature?

The immortals in any generation are necessarily few. There are, indeed, always many men of talent, of industry, of political capacity, of literary faculty. There are many who render worthy services to Church and Commonwealth, and leave behind them honorable names. Some of these, especially in political life, loom very large for a time on the attention of their contemporaries. Their names occur incessantly in the newspapers; and reams of their utterances are yearly published. We are almost tempted to think of them as great men; yet the note of originality and distinction is so completely absent from their sayings and doings, that, before a generation is over, "they are clean forgotten, as a dead man out of mind." I am daily reminded of this when I notice how completely unknown to the millions, even by name, are men, who, within living memory, have been deemed sufficiently great to have graves assigned to them in Westminster Abbey. And though eminent writers are remembered longer than others, this is true of them also. Many of them have but a temporary success, and a *succès d'estime*. Very soon the mention of their names awakens no recollection, and we have to refer to some biographical dictionary to learn about any thing which they did or wrote. There are never more than a small handful of living men of whom we can say, that, when their bodies are buried in the dust, their names will live for evermore. To class any man with the immortals is to pay him so high a compliment that it can scarcely ever be spoken without misgiving; and yet it can, I believe, be said with truth, that Mr. J. R. Lowell will be remembered on both sides of the Atlantic long after most of those are forgotten who now occupy a far larger share than he ever did of the public attention.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

He was in all respects a child of the nineteenth century with its varied culture. I have always mentally compared him to Browning's

> "Cleon, the poet, from the sprinkled isles,
> Lily on lily, that o'erlace the sea,
> And laugh their pride when the light wave lisps 'Greece.'"

He has the same completeness as Cleon:—

> "We of these latter days, with greater mind
> Than our forerunners, since more composite,
> Look not so great, beside their simple way,
> To a judge who only sees one way at once—
> Compares the small part of some man in us
> With some whole man of the heroic age,
> Great in his way—not ours, nor meant for ours.
> And ours is greater, had we skill to know.
> . . . . . .
> I have not chanted verse like Homer, no—
> Nor swept string like Terpander, no—no carved
> And painted men like Phidias and his friend:
> I am not great as they are, point by point;
> But I have entered into sympathy
> With these four, running them into one soul
> Who, separate, ignored each other's arts.
> Say, is it nothing that I know them all?
> The wild flower was the larger—I have dashed
> Rose-blood upon its petals, pricked its cup's
> Honey with wine, and driven its seed to fruit,
> And shew a better flower, if not so large:
> I stand myself. Refer this to the gods
> Whose gift alone it is!"

I will not apologize for the length of the quotation, since it exactly expresses both Mr. Lowell's strength and his weakness. He might have been greater, had he been in some respects less. He might have done more, had he not known so much. He would have attained to a more powerful originality, if it had not been a part of his training to be familiar with, and to be pervaded by, the best thoughts of many minds in many ages. His greatness in a single form of excellence would have been more unchallenged and permanent, but for his many claims to admiration. We do not at all agree with Mr. Browning's all-complete Greek poet of the decadence, with his mastery of every thing —*totus teres atque rotundus*. We think that Mr. Lowell would have been a far greater man in the eyes of posterity, if, like Tennyson, he had devoted his life to the one purpose of poetry, and if, instead of being all that he was, he had concentrated his whole genius upon the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gift of song. What he has attained to in a page or two of his verses serves to show how much more he might have done. But to complain of this would be idle and ungrateful. We are, each of us, what we *can* be, what our training, our temperaments, and our age make us; and it is absurd to depreciate any one on the ground that he would have been still greater had he been another man.

Mr. Lowell was much else besides a poet, and had many more claims on the grateful remembrance both of Americans and Englishmen. At some of these claims we now may glance.

He was a scholar, acquainted, and accurately acquainted, with Greek and Latin and with the principal languages of modern Europe. As a student he devoted many hours of every day to the earnest and systematic pursuit of knowledge and self-culture. Two great writers —Carlyle, in his lecture on "The Hero as a Man of Letters," and Emerson, in his "Representative Men"—have sketched the ideal of quiet dignity and devotion which marks the man who has accepted it as one of his duties to make the most of the intellect which God has given him. Mr. Lowell presented a finished specimen of that ideal.

He was in the best sense of the word a patriot. He did not, indeed, plunge himself into the too often turbid stream of political intrigue and agitation, but with his voice and his pen he exercised a powerful influence over the destinies of his country. As editor of the "Atlantic Monthly," and as a writer, he was a leader of national thought. It might be said of him, as Sir Edwin Arnold says of another,—

> "He spake
> By voice of many thousand tongues. He swayed
> The pens that break the sceptres."

Those who guide politics, and those who mould political thought, are, though they do not seem to be, incomparably more powerful than the professional rulers and politicians. Deep thinkers are to administrative statesmen as the voices are to the echoes, and the sunbeams themselves to their reflected light. It is they who create that public opinion, of which Landor wrote that "the public voice shakes the palace; the public voice penetrates the grave; the public voice precedes the chariot of Almighty God, and is heard at the judgment-seat." The distinction between the scholar-poet or thinker and the ordinary publicist is, that the former does not trouble himself about the small combinations of personal greed and ambition of which all party-strife is full. He cares only for the great questions which affect the interests of humanity; he joins only in the Armageddon battles in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which all the true sons and servants of God are ranged against the forces of oppression, robbery, and wrong.

It was no small part of the service rendered by Mr. Lowell as a patriot, that, more than most men, he strengthened the blessed influences which bind England and America together. By birth a direct representative of the Pilgrim Fathers, he was yet most deeply attached to England, which he made a second home. Here, as in America, he was justly beloved, both as a man and as the worthy representative of the United States to the British people. Thus he furnished an illustration of his own line,—

> "Before man made us citizens, great Nature made us men."

He helped to remind the two nations—the children of the ancient monarchy and of the mighty republic—that the same blood runs in their veins; that we are one in the memories of the past and in the hopes of the future; that we both speak the tongue of Shakspere, both hold the faith and morals of Milton, are both meant to be giant pioneers, marching side by side in the very vanguard of Christian evangelization and human progress. When an American friend gave to the Church of St. Margaret's the window in honor of Milton, who often worshipped there, Mr. Whittier wrote the four lines:—

> "The New World honors him whose lofty plea
> For England's freedom made her own more sure,
> Whose song, immortal as its theme, shall be
> Their common freehold while both worlds endure."

And when the American, with characteristic readiness of munificence, gave the window in honor of Sir Walter Raleigh, "the father of the United States,"—whose headless body lies buried under the altar of St. Margaret's,—Mr. Lowell wrote the four lines inscribed on it:—

> "The New World's sons, from England's breast we drew
> Such milk as bids remember whence we came;
> Proud of her past, from which our present grew,
> This window we erect to Raleigh's name."

Again: Mr. Lowell was an admirable speaker. No one was more welcome than he at all literary and social gatherings. His address as lord-rector of St. Andrew's was an almost perfect specimen of what such an address should be,—weighty, learned, brilliant, eloquent. Alike in this country and in his own, where there are so many good speakers, he was regarded by common consent as unsurpassed in gracefulness. When the bust of Coleridge was given to Westminster Abbey

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by an American citizen, Mr. Lowell, then the United States minister, was naturally chosen to give the address in the ancient Chapter House, before the bust was unveiled. It was full of an indescribable charm, and I shall never forget the perfect way in which he recited the lines, which he selected as a specimen of Coleridge's nature-painting:—

> "Beneath yon birch with silver bark,
> And branches pendulous and fair,
> The brook falls scattered down the rock,
> And all is mossy there."

I remember, too, the hearty laugh which greeted his first words in a speech at a dinner of the Literary Fund, when on an exceedingly raw, gusty, and bitter evening of early May, he referred to Thomson's

> "Come, gentle Spring, ethereal mildness, come,
> And from the bosom of yon dropping cloud,
> While music wakes around, veiled in a shower
> Of shadowing roses, on our plains descend,"

and reminded us how England was at that moment enjoying all the "ethereal mildness" of her customary spring.

Among the students of the world's best literature, Mr. Lowell held a foremost place. It was not for nothing that he had written so much, and lectured so often, on the best poets, and had himself edited the works of Marvell, Donne, Keats, Wordsworth, and Shelley. As a professor of belles-lettres at Harvard, the post in which he proved himself so worthy a successor of Longfellow, in 1855, he had to keep the claims of literature before successive generations of young students; and his essays on Chaucer, Spenser, and Shakspere, on Milton, Pope, and Dryden, on Wordsworth and Keats, furnish sufficient evidence that he had bathed himself deeply in the purest "wells of English undefiled." But he was also familiar with the greatest poets and thinkers of other nations, and has left us thorough and conscientious studies of Dante, of Lessing, of Rousseau, and of Calderon.

Added to these great attainments and accomplishments, Mr. Lowell possessed the rare gift of humor. He has been compared to Samuel Butler, the author of "Hudibras;" and if the "Biglow Papers" do not furnish so many quotations which have become the common stock of English illustration, it must be admitted that their tone is larger and nobler than that of Butler's masterpiece. They were entirely original; and even the "Notices of an Independent Press," by which they were preceded, conveyed a much-needed lesson to American journalism. Though written before the poet was thirty years old, they en-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

force a burning protest against slavery and war. When we quote such lines as,—

> "A marciful Providunce fashioned us holler,
> O' purpose thet we might our princerples swaller;"

or the inimitably witty verses,—

> "Parson Wilbur he calls all these argimunts lies;
> Sez they're nothin' on airth but jest *fee, faw, fum;*
> An' thet all this big talk of our destinies
> Is half on it ign'ance an' t' other half rum,
> But John P.
> Robinson, he
> Sez it ain't no sech thing; an', of course, so must we.
>
> Parson Wilbur sez *he* never heerd in his life
> Thet th' Apostles rigged out in their swaller-tail coats,
> An' marched round in front of a drum an' a fife,
> To git some on 'em office, and some on 'em votes;
> But John P.
> Robinson, he
> Sez they didn't know everythin' down in Judee,"—

we must not forget, that, under the rippled and flashing surface of their wit, the "Biglow Papers" hid ocean-depths of intense and noble feeling, and that the generous sympathies which they were intended to strengthen helped to keep a nation in the paths of righteousness. By them, and under the semblance of their boisterous fun, Mr. Lowell earned the glory of being, perhaps, the only American who attempted "to laugh down, as well as to fight down, the propagandists of slavery, the oppressors of the slave,"—the only American who was able to pierce hypocrisy and vulgarity through and through with shafts of radiant ridicule as with the arrows of the dawn.

Perhaps Mr. Lowell is thought of more often as a critic than as any thing else except a poet. But his criticism, though keen, though never foolishly and blindly eulogistic, was yet of that lambent kind which is akin to charity. His shafts were swift-winged; but they were never envenomed. They struck; but either they gave no needless pain, or brought healing in the kindly wounds which they inflicted. I think that the "Fable for Critics," in which, with such keen intuition, he gave a critical estimate of the merits and defects of his most eminent fellow-countrymen, has been under-estimated rather than otherwise. It was marked not only by its sparkling and acute playfulness, and the clever oddity of rhymes in which even Browning has not surpassed him, but also by a very unusual power of seeing

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the real men through the glamour of temporary popularity and the cloud of passing dislike.

But while I have thus spoken of Mr. Lowell's many services, I do not think that his several excellences in these directions would have sufficed to preserve his memory. I am far from sure that his prose-writings will live. They have neither the unique charm and Olympian grace of Matthew Arnold's, nor the lightning-like intensity of Carlyle's, nor even the genial and mellow wisdom of Sir Arthur Helps's. It is as a poet, mainly if not exclusively, that he will live in the grateful regard of his fellow-men. To poets more than to any others a deep debt of spiritual thankfulness is due. Now, Mr. Lowell was one of the first poets among the famous Americans of this generation. It was by poetry that he taught his chief lessons; it is as a poet that he will be remembered in the years that are to come.

How true was his own estimate of what a poet should be, and should aim at! In his "Incident in a Railroad Car," after describing how a student awed and softened all his fellow-travellers by reading to them the glowing and manly verse of Robert Burns, he says,—

"Never did poesy appear
So full of heaven to me, as when
I saw how it would pierce through pride and fear
To the lives of the coarsest men.

It may be glorious to write
Thoughts that shall glad the two or three
High souls, like those far stars that come in sight
Once in a century;

But better far it is to speak
One simple word, which now and then
Shall waken their free nature in the weak
And friendless sons of men.

He who doth this, in verse or prose,
May be forgotten in his day,
But surely shall be crowned at last with those
Who live and speak for aye."

In "What Rabbi Jehosha Said," he sighed forth the same aspiration:—

"'Twere glorious, no doubt, to be
One of the strong-winged Hierarchy,
To burn with Seraphs, or to shine
With Cherubs, deathlessly divine;
Yet I, perhaps, poor earthly clod,
Could I forget myself in God,
Could I but find my nature's clew
Simply as birds and blossoms do

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

And but for one rapt moment know
'Tis Heaven must come, not we must go,
Should win my place as near the throne
As the pearl-angel of its zone,
And God would listen mid the throng
For my one breath of perfect song,
That, in its simple human way,
Said all the Host of Heaven could say."

In the lines about himself, in the "Fable for Critics," he says,—

"There is Lowell, who's striving Parnassus to climb
With a whole bale of *isms* tied together with rhyme;
He might get on alone, spite of brambles and bowlders,
But he can't with that bundle he has on his shoulders.
The top of the hill he will ne'er come nigh reaching
Till he learns the distinction 'twixt singing and preaching.
His lyre has some chords which would sound pretty well,
But he'd rather by half make a drum of the shell,
And rattle away till he's old as Methusalem
At the head of a march to the last New Jerusalem."

In these lines, which we now read with so much interest, we see that Lowell was aware of his own source of weakness—the very source of weakness of which I have spoken; but, on the other hand, if the last six lines are any thing but ironical, they are mistaken. The chief element of his strength, and not of his weakness, was the intensity of that moral sympathy which makes his best poetry distinctly didactic. The best chords of his lyre are exactly those in which he means to preach; and it is his main glory that he stood in the forefront of that radiant band of mighty orators, and ethereal poets, and heaven-born rulers, whose eloquence and wisdom emancipated eighty thousand slaves, and whose names are therefore written, like those of Clarkson and Wilberforce, on the noblest page of their country's history. Among the poems of Lowell that will live is that which he addressed to the pioneer of the emancipation crusade,—William Lloyd Garrison. It was the same magnificent conviction in the omnipotence of right that inspired Mr. Lowell's lines on the crisis of December, 1845, which are among the grandest that he ever wrote:—

"Once to every man and nation comes the moment to decide,
In the strife of Truth with Falsehood, for the good or evil side;
Some great cause, God's new Messiah, offering each the bloom or blight,
Parts the goat upon the left hand, and the sheep upon the right,
And the choice goes by forever 'twixt that darkness and that light."

Nor was it only for the slave, and against the slave-owner, that Lowell could plead. He was one whose heart bled for the sorrows of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the poor. He saw the glory of God's world, and in some of his noblest verses has fulfilled that function of the poet which consists in using his fine sense to interpret to our blunter conceptions the meaning of its beauty, as in the prelude of his "Vision of Sir Launfal."

A lesson no less deep and sacred was taught in one more poem, the last, I believe, that he ever published. It describes how the poet saw in a dream the great Archangel with his "fire gold flickering hair," and in his "blinding armor," standing to weigh the hopes and fears of men. It was called "St. Michael the Weigher."

It is in virtue of such poems, such thoughts, such lessons, as these, that the name of Mr. Lowell will be remembered in the literature of the English-speaking race; and, like Longfellow, he was happy enough to write not a few of them. Such are "Rabbi Yussouf," and the "Ode at the Harvard Commemoration of 1865," and those glorious lines which tell us that

> "He's a slave who would not be
> In the right with two or three.
> He's a slave who would not choose
> Hatred, slander, and abuse,
> Rather than in silence shrink
> From the truth he needs must think."

Two criticisms may, however, fairly be urged against some of Mr. Lowell's poems. Some, which are simply the poems of culture rather than of humanity, remind us irresistibly of other poets who had preceded him. In the poems of his youth, few of which would of themselves live, we trace the notes and the feelings of Byron and Shelley. We say, as we read, "This poem is not exactly an echo of Wordsworth, nor this of Longfellow, nor this of Tennyson; and yet they could hardly have been written but for the unconscious spell exercised over the writer's mind by the enchantment of those poets." "Rhoecus," for instance, is a truly exquisite poem, almost perfect in its finish and Greek-like delicacy; yet we cannot help asking whether it could have been written by any one who had not delighted in that exquisite volume of Hellenics by Landor, which was too classically perfect to touch the general heart. Again: in the lovely verses on "What Rabbi Jehoshah Said" is it possible to overlook a reminiscence of Browning's "Theocrite"? Lowell was never a plagiarist, but in some of his poems he lacks the absolute independence which places men among the very greatest.

The only other criticism which must be made, if we are to avoid the falsehood of that indiscriminate eulogy which detracts from the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

value of honest praise, is, that he was sometimes defective in distinctness, and sometimes in symmetry, as well as sometimes in melody. The latter defect is not nearly so obtrusive as it is, for instance, in Browning. Lowell never gives us those lines, which, as De Quincey said, "would splinter the teeth of a crocodile." But the lack of symmetry injures the sovereign merit of one of his best poems, "The Vision of Sir Launfal." The story takes too long in the telling, and, splendid as is the first prelude, both it and the second prelude are too long, and would have been better as separate poems. And this must be said without at all forgetting the fact that the first prelude contains the most glorious and perfect lines which Lowell ever wrote: I mean the passage which begins with the words:—

> "Not only around our infancy
> Doth heaven with all its splendors lie;
> Daily, with souls that cringe and plot,
> We Sinai climb, and know it not.
>
> Over our manhood bend the skies;
> Against our fallen and traitor lives
> The great winds utter prophecies;
> With our faint hearts the mountain strives."

This burst of poetic inspiration ends—for it is too long and happily too well-known to quote—with the line,—

> "In the nice ear of Nature which song is the best?"

But the third defect—the lack of a clear, definite impression left by some of the poems—is more serious. We may take as an instance the often and deservedly quoted "Parable." Here it is impossible not to see that the poet has had something to say, and has hardly said it; that he has had a precious lesson to teach, and has not succeeded in telling us exactly what it is. The defect is the more curious because it does not arise from that tortuosity of form, and shipwreck of ordinary grammar, which, apart from their novelty and profoundity, lend needless difficulty to some of Browning's poems. Mr. Lowell never shows any lack of lucidity of expression: it is the thought which is left but half revealed, like a statue covered with a veil of lawn.

Yet these blemishes in Mr. Lowell's poetry are but as spots on the sun. What poet is free from them? His verse, for many a long day, will live, and "will add sunlight to daylight by making the happy happier." That alone is an immense service; but in Mr. Lowell's case it was but one of many. And happily his merits brought him timely rewards. We shall not have to reckon him among the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Mighty poets in their misery dead."

England and America vied in doing him honor; and the honor came to him in his lifetime, and not too late. In 1855 he succeeded Longfellow as professor in the first of American universities; in 1877 he was appointed minister of the United States to Spain, in 1879 minister to England; in 1883 he was chosen lord-rector of St. Andrew's University in Scotland. Harvard made him her favorite teacher; Oxford, if he could have accepted it, would have elected him to the professorship once held by John Keble and by Matthew Arnold; Cambridge gave him an honorary degree. He has received in Westminster Abbey a testimony of eminence which is accorded only to earth's greatest and best.

He knew indeed, as we all know, the bitter sorrows of life. He had known what it was to lay in earth what his soul held most dear, and it was to him, when his wife died, that Longfellow addressed the exquisite lines, which told how—

"From that hushed and darkened room
Two angels issued where but one went in."

But whatever sorrows came to him, he bore them like a good and wise man. He served his country; he benefited his race; he welded one more golden link in the amity of kindred nations. But above all this, and more than all this, he set a high example to his fellow-men, of pure aims, of manly dignity, of faithful friendship, of honorable service. By his writings he "lent ardor to virtue, and confidence to truth." This is the highest praise which it is given to our feebleness to win. We should be specially grateful to those richly-gifted men, who, while they have instructed us by their genius, have also set us the example of noble lives. If we cannot emulate their greatness, the humblest of us can follow their footsteps in the effort to love and to serve, to do good and to be good; and

"When our souls shall leave this dwelling,
The glory of one fair and virtuous action
Is above all the 'scutcheons on our tombs,
Or silken banners over us."

F. W. FARRAR.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ONE REMEDY FOR MUNICIPAL MISGOVERNMENT.

In these days, when so many sanguine philanthropists are advocating large extensions of governmental activity, and indeed are hoping for a beneficent re-organization of society, in which popular governments shall plan, order, make, store, and distribute every thing,—all without unduly abridging individual liberty,—it may be wholesome to discuss sometimes the practical shortcomings of democratic government within its present rather limited field. Before we take courage to believe that governmental management would be successful in many new fields and on a much larger scale, we ought to be satisfied with the results of that management within its actual province. It is more instructive to discuss shortcomings close at hand than those remote, evils right under the eyes of the people than those they can hardly discern. To discuss the evils which attend municipal government is, therefore, more edifying than to consider the evils of the national and state administrations.

In peaceful times the national government is remote from the daily life of the average citizen. Its wastefulness does not come home to him. Its corrupting patronage and jobbery are unperceived by him. Errors in the financial policy of the government become plain to him, only when he experiences their ill effects. The post-office is the only function of the national government which concerns him intimately, and that function is really a simple business, and has always been a government monopoly; so that the average citizen who gets his mail with tolerable regularity, and has no experience of any other method of sending letters and newspapers generally, thinks that the post-office business is as well done by government as it could be by any agency. Municipal functions, on the other hand, touch the average citizen very nearly. It makes a great difference to him whether the city keeps good schools or bad, and clean streets or dirty, supplies him with good water or bad, and taxes him fairly or unfairly. Moreover, all critics of the working of the institutions of the United States during the last fifty years—whether friendly or hostile, whether foreign or native—agree that municipal government has been the field in which the least effi-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ciency for good has been exhibited and the greatest positive evils have been developed. To what causes the existing evils of municipal government in the United States are to be ascribed, and in what direction the remedies are to be sought, are, therefore, questions of the profoundest interest for the average citizen, as well as for the social philosopher.

It is easy to attribute these evils to the inherent viciousness and recklessness of the urban population,—wickedness and folly which are more and more effective for evil as the proportion of urban to rural population rises. It is easy for people whose forefathers came to this western world one or more generations ago to believe that the people who have just come are the source of all municipal woes. But neither of these explanations can be accepted as probable or reasonable. When we examine the working of the American democracy on the greatest state questions,—such as independence of Great Britain, the federation of the States, and the indissoluble union of the States,—we find that the democracy has dealt wisely with these great questions, and just as wisely in the generation of 1860–90 as in the generations of Revolutionary times. We observe, that, in the management of a great national debt, our democracy has exhibited better judgment, and, on the whole, juster sentiments, than any oligarchy or tyranny has ever exhibited. We see that private property is more secure under the democratic form of government than under any other form. We find that there has been an unequalled amount of diffused intellectual and moral energy among the mass of the people during the last forty years; and we are sure that the democratic form of government, working in combination with democratic social mobility, is eminently favorable to religious, social, and industrial progress. Into the immense material development of the period since the civil war there has gone a deal of sound moral force as well as of mental and physical activity. The census teaches us that the proportion of the urban to the rural population has rapidly increased during the last thirty years; but these new city people have all come in from the country. During this same period, rural town governments have fully maintained their excellence, and have in many States exhibited a new efficiency and enterprise; as, for example, in the development of primary and secondary education, the maintenance of free libraries, the restriction of the liquor traffic, and the improvement of bridges and highways. I submit, therefore, that there is no good reason to believe in any widespread and progressive demoralization of the mass of the population, whether

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

urban or rural. I would not be understood, however, to maintain that there have not been particular spots or particular occasions, some of them conspicuous, where failure and disgrace have resulted from moral causes; such as indifference on the part of voters to the bad character of the men they voted for; the corrupt procuring of votes in return for appointments, licenses, or tariffs; or the importation into municipal affairs of passions aroused in national party strife. My contention is, that, in spite of these manifestations, there is no good reason to believe that American constituencies, whether large or small, have frequently been dishonest or corrupt at heart, although they have sometimes chosen dishonest or corrupt agents.

The theory that the immigration of a few millions of foreigners within thirty years is the true cause of municipal evils in the United States must also be rejected, although the too quick admission to the suffrage of men who have had no acquaintance with free institutions has doubtless increased the evils of city government in a few localities. The great majority of the immigrants have been serviceable people; and of late years many of them—particularly the Germans, English, Scotch, Scandinavians, and Swiss—have had a better education than the average rural American can obtain. The experienced voters of the country cannot shelter themselves behind the comparatively small contingent of the inexperienced, particularly when the former are wholly responsible for admitting the latter to the suffrage.

I venture to suggest in this paper another explanation (a partial one, to be sure) of the comparative failure of municipal government in the United States,—an explanation which points to a remedy.

It is observable that the failures of the democratic form of government have occurred chiefly in those matters of municipal administration which present many novelties, and belong to the domain of applied science: such as the levying of taxes; the management of water-supplies and drainage systems; the paving, lighting, and cleaning of highways; the control of companies which sell in city streets light, heat, power, transportation for persons, and communication by electricity; the care of the public health; and the provision of proper means of public enjoyment, such as open squares, gardens, and parks. All these matters require for their comprehension and proper management a high degree of scientific training, and all of them require the continuous execution, through many years, of far-reaching plans. I proceed to consider each of the topics I have mentioned, with the intention of showing that antiquated methods of municipal administration,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and particularly short and insecure tenures for the heads of departments, are responsible for the greater part of the municipal evils which are bringing discredit on free institutions, and that the altered nature and conditions of municipal business require that these old methods, which answered very well in earlier times, be fundamentally reformed.

In the course of this rapid sketch it will appear at various points that the monarchical and aristocratic governments of Europe have grappled with modern municipal problems much more successfully than our democratic government. The discussion will, I think, suggest that explanations of this result, so unsatisfactory to lovers of liberty, are to be found in the slowness of a democracy to change governmental methods, and in the comparatively small and temporary influence of political and administrative leaders under a form of government which makes frequent appeal to universal suffrage.

I. I begin with the levying of municipal taxes. One of the greatest mischiefs in American municipal government is the system of local taxation; for this system is, in many places, an effective school in evasion and perjury, and, as a rule, an agency of stinging injustice. The trouble is twofold.

In the first place, the incidence of taxes is one of the most difficult subjects in political economy, and very few American legislators know any thing about it. More than that, very few Americans in any profession or walk of life know any thing about it. The colleges and universities of the country are greatly to blame for this condition of things. They never began to teach political science in any serious way till about twenty years ago. The generation of men now in their prime either never studied any political economy at all, or studied it in one small textbook for a few hours a week for perhaps half a year at school or college, or they picked up a few notions about it in the intervals of professional or business occupation after they had entered upon their life-work. The number of living Americans who have any thorough and systematic knowledge of the principles of political economy, including the incidence of taxes, is absolutely insignificant; and these few are mostly either professors, or business-men who have been also life-long students. The average business-man and the aver age professional man have never given any attention to the science, except perhaps to some little scrap of it, like the doctrine of protection, which has temporarily had some political interest.

Secondly, the forms of property have changed so prodigiously

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

within forty years, that a theory of assessment which worked reasonably well before 1850 has become thoroughly mischievous in 1890. The old theory of taxation was, that every man should be assessed at his home on all his property. It was all there, or it returned thither periodically, like his ox-cart or his vessel. If, by rare chance, a man had property out of the town where he lived, it was a piece of real estate which was to be assessed for taxes in the town where it lay, and there only. Nowadays in cities this is all changed. In the country and in remote communities by the sea, the lakes, and the rivers, the old forms of property—namely, lands, buildings, implements, live-stock, carriages, and vessels—remain the same that they were fifty years ago, and in such communities there is no difficulty about the assessment and incidence of taxes; but in all the urban populations there are innumerable forms of property which are of very recent creation. The various bonds of railroad, telegraph, telephone, land, and bridge companies—which are a kind of preferred stock without any liability or any voting power—have been almost entirely created within thirty years. The English statute which provides for incorporation with limited liability dates only from the year 1855. The innumerable stocks of transportation, financial, and manufacturing companies, have almost all been created since the present type of American municipality was established. The history of Harvard University, like that of any old institution, illustrates the newness of these forms of property which have become so common. In 1860 only two per cent of the quick capital of Harvard University was in railroad stocks and bonds; now fifty per cent is so invested. If we go back in the history of the university thirty years more, to the year 1830, we find that the university owned neither stock nor bond, except fifty-two shares in a Boston bank, one share in a local canal, and certain interests in three wooden bridges leading out of Boston. Legislators, assessors, and voters have been quite unable to grasp the new situation so suddenly created. They have been unable to master quickly enough the new conditions. The conservatism of a democracy is intense, partly because the average voter is afraid of administrative novelties, and partly because inexperienced officials necessarily follow precedent. The more rapid the change of officials, the more surely will this unreasoning following of precedent prevail. A new official is afraid to depart from custom, lest he fall into some dangerous or absurd difficulty. Yet to follow precedent when conditions have changed is the surest way to fall into both absurdity and danger. Clinging to the old

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

theory that a man was to be taxed at the place of his residence on all of his property,—a perfectly good theory under former conditions, and, indeed, under present conditions among a rural population,—American legislators and assessors have endeavored to tax at the place of residence property which did not lie there, never returned thither, and was wholly invisible there. Hence all the inquisitorial methods of assessment which disgrace the American cities.

At present, in many States of the Union the attempt is made to tax the house and the mortgage on it, the merchant's stock and the note he gave for the money with which he bought it, a railroad and the bonds which built it. So far as this method is successful, it falsifies the total valuation of the country, and produces inequality and injustice in the distribution of the public burdens. So far as it is unsuccessful, it causes another kind of injustice, excites suspicions and enmities among neighbors, and dulls the public conscience. These grave evils take effect, for the most part, in urban communities, and there work their most serious mischiefs. Yet they result from popular persistence in a theory which was perfectly good no long time ago, and from the inability of ill-trained and often changed officials to adapt public policy quickly to new conditions of finance and trade very suddenly created. To deal wisely with public taxation in the face of rapid and progressive changes in business and social conditions requires on the part of the tax officials exact knowledge, sound judgment, wide experience, and continuous service: in short, it requires highly trained experts, serving the public on independent tenures, for long terms.

II. The management of water-supplies and drainage systems is another municipal function which is of recent growth and of a highly scientific character. As a regular part of city business it has all been created within fifty years. I was brought up in one of the best built houses in Boston, situated near the top of Beacon Hill. The house drainage was discharged into a cesspool in the rear of the lot, and the whole family drank the water from a deep well which was not more than fifty feet from the cesspool. Moreover, five private stables stood near the rear of the lot, all of them but a short distance from the well, and the natural slope of the land was from the stables and the cesspool toward the well. There was at that time no sewerage system in the city of Boston and no public water-supply.

The mayor of Boston is elected to-day in the same way and for the same term as in those not remote times; but his function and the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

whole municipal business which he superintends have utterly changed. I need not say that the provision of adequate supplies of wholesome water in a large city is a work of great and increasing difficulty, which can be successfully managed only by men who have received an elaborate training, and who have labored for years continuously in that one field. The difficult subjects of average annual precipitation, natural water-sheds, prevention of pollution, and effective distribution, will always task the full powers of gifted men who have received the best possible training. Continuity of policy is of great importance in regard to the water-supply of any large population. The same may be said of the related problem of sewerage. The disposition of the fluid and semi-fluid refuse of cities is an engineering problem which presents great variety in different localities, and almost always great difficulty. In our expanding cities the moment one difficulty or danger is overcome, another presents itself. The planning of sewerage works pre-eminently requires foresight; and durability is always a primary merit in their construction. That the water-works and sewer system of a great municipality should be under the charge of constantly shifting officials is irrational to the last degree. The forms and methods of our city governments were determined when no such problems were to be solved by city agents.

III. I turn next to the care of highways, including paving, lighting, and cleaning. It is unnecessary to dilate upon the intelligence and skill which are needed in modern cities for the right conduct of this department of the public work. The services of engineers of the highest intelligence and skill, and of the highest professional honor and business capacity, are constantly requisite. In the great European capitals, these departments of municipal service are admirably managed by men trained, in schools long famous, expressly for the planning and direction of such public works, and kept in service, like officers of the army and navy, during good behavior and efficiency. There is not a great capital in Europe, I had almost said there is not even a small city, which does not immeasurably excel in the care of its highways the best governed of American cities. The monarchical and bureaucratic governments of Europe see to it that city streets and country highways are smooth, hard, and clean. The streets of European capitals, and their public squares, are incessantly swept and washed, and all rubbish, manure, and offal are promptly removed; but in most American cities the manure of animals, the sputa of human beings, and much other vegetable and animal refuse, are suffered

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to dry up, and blow about as dust. The footways in American cities are as inferior to those of foreign cities as the carriage-ways, in respect to convenience and cleanliness, except, indeed, that there are some portions of the oldest European cities in which originally no footways were provided. Spain is not considered a particularly clean country; but I remember sitting down in a small public square in Seville to eat an orange, and so absolutely tidy was the enclosure that I could see no place where it was possible to leave the skin of the orange, and I had to carry it away with me. The inferiority of American cities in this respect is not due to lack of sufficient expenditure on the highways: it is due primarily to the fact that competent experts are not steadily employed to direct this important branch of municipal business, and, secondarily, to a flood of abuses which become possible in the absence of competent and honest supervision. There is no point at which municipal government in the United States has been so complete a failure as here. It has disastrously failed to provide for the convenience and comfort of the people in a matter which seriously affects the daily well-being of every inhabitant.

IV. I speak next of an important municipal function which is of very recent origin, which, indeed, has hardly as yet been developed at all; namely, the control in the public interest of the companies which sell light, heat, power, transportation, and telegraphic or telephonic communication. The value of these franchises has only recently been demonstrated; and the many ways in which these companies may affect the business interests and the comfort, health, and pleasure of a compact community, are not yet fully developed. The introduction of electricity for all these purposes, except heating, has very recently greatly modified the methods of the purveying corporations. Not a single American city has succeeded in dealing with these serviceable monopolies justly and at the same time to the public advantage; and, so long as the present modes of electing and organizing a municipal government continue in this country, we may well despair of seeing any effective control over these corporations exercised in the public interest. They are controlled in Europe by skilful engineers whose duty is to the public, and whose authority is exercised steadily and independently. This grave municipal problem is, however, very new. It is only about forty years ago that the first street-railways were built in the United States; the telephone seems to many of us a thing of yesterday; and the introduction of electric lights and electric cars is quite within the memory of children still in school. Within

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

five years a wholly new class of municipal difficulties has arisen from the multiplication of overhead wires, for all sorts of purposes, along and across the public highways. How absurd it is to expect an effective discharge of supervisory functions over these novel and enterprising corporations, which are eagerly pursuing their private interests, from city officials who are elected by universal suffrage once a year or once in two years, or who depend for their positions on the single will of an official so elected!

V. One would imagine, *a priori*, that "government by the people, for the people," would always have been careful of the people's health; but here we come upon one of the most conspicuous failures of free institutions in urban populations. Democratic government is at present at a serious disadvantage, in comparison with aristocratic and monarchical governments, as regards the care of the public health. The evidence of that disadvantage is of two sorts. In the first place, there are several cities in the United States which already, in spite of their comparative newness, have a death-rate absolutely higher than that of the best conducted cities of Europe. London, with its six millions of people, has habitually a lower death-rate than Boston, New York, Brooklyn, or Chicago. A few facts must suffice to illustrate this point. In the third quarter of 1889, the summer quarter, Chicago, Boston, and New York had a higher death-rate than Rome, Milan, and Turin, in hot Italy. In the fourth quarter, Chicago had a higher death-rate than Copenhagen, Christiania, Prague, Hamburg, Bremen, Cologne, Dresden, Leipsic, Berlin, Lyons, Amsterdam, Edinburgh, Sheffield, Birmingham, Liverpool, or London. In the first quarter of 1890, the death-rate in New York was a little higher than the mean rate in the twenty-eight great English towns, including London, some of those great towns being confessedly in habitually bad sanitary condition. The population of New York is about equal to that of Berlin. In the first quarter of 1890, the deaths in New York were at the annual rate of 28.8 persons in every 1,000, against 23.3 in Berlin; a fact which means that in those three months 2,600 more persons died in New York than in Berlin, although New York has great advantages over Berlin as regards both climate and situation. In the fourth quarter of 1890, the death-rate in New York and Brooklyn was higher than in Berlin by more than 3 in 1,000. In the second place, in those American cities which have made some effort to preserve the public health and to lower the death-rate, no such success has rewarded the effort as in many European cities,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

although the newness of most American cities should give them great advantage over the European. London, which is supposed to contain in East London the largest mass of human misery in the civilized world, is the best example in the world of sanitary success. Berlin is another striking example of sanitary success under extremely unfavorable conditions. Before 1871 the annual death-rate in Berlin had for thirty years been from 37 to 39 per 1,000. Of late years, 21 to 23 per 1,000 have been common rates,—an immense annual saving of life, which is chiefly due to the construction of a good water-supply and a good sewerage system. The worst district of Glasgow —No. 14, a physical and moral plague-spot—had in 1871 a population of 14,000 and a death-rate of 42.3 per 1,000; in 1881 a population of about 8,000 and a death-rate of 38.3; in 1888 a population of about 7,000 and a death-rate of 32.45. No American city has obtained sanitary successes like these. Boston among cities, and Massachusetts among states, have taken as much pains in sanitary matters as any American communities, yet the death-rate has not been reduced during the past twenty-five years, either in the city or in the state at large. How much saving of life is possible under favorable conditions may be inferred from two comparisons. In the year 1888, the death-rate in Boston was 24.57 per 1,000: in the adjoining, or rather interjected, town of Brookline, it was 11.43. In urban England, the death-rate during the last quarter of 1890 was 21.2 per 1,000: among the remaining population, it was 17.5 per 1,000.

What are the reasons of the comparative inefficiency of democratic government in the care of the public health? I maintain that they are not vice and criminal negligence, but ignorance and unwisdom. Is it not obvious that the care of the public health requires a high degree of intelligence and of scientific training in the officers who have charge of it? and that our system of municipal administration almost precludes the employment of such competent officers? Preventive medicine is a comparatively new science, and it has been more effectively cultivated in Europe than in this country, partly because the methods of municipal administration which there prevail give a chance for putting its principles into practice which American methods have not given. In its respect for personal liberty and the rights of the individual, democracy lets ignorance and selfishness poison water-supplies with fecal matter, distribute milk infected with diphtheria, scarlet-fever, or tuberculosis, and spread contagious diseases by omitting the precautions of isolation and disinfection.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Clearly, this feebleness of democracy is largely due to ignorance. Aristocratic and autocratic governments have learned quicker than democracies the economic and humane value of sanitary science, and have applied that science more promptly and efficiently. If the sufferings inflicted on the poorer and less intelligent portions of the community, and the economic losses inflicted on the whole community, by incompetent practitioners of medicine and surgery, could be brought home to American legislators, the quacks and charlatans would have short shrift, in spite of the inevitable interference with so-called private rights. Registration acts for practitioners of medicine would be promptly passed, and vigorously enforced. In like manner, if a democracy were only persuaded that contagious diseases—like yellow-fever, small-pox, and diphtheria—might be closely limited by isolation, the present careless methods of dealing with these scourges would soon be as obsolete as surgery and midwifery without antiseptics. The multitude does not know how typhoid-fever lurks in contaminated water; it does not comprehend either the suffering or the economic loss which inevitably falls on any population breathing polluted air, or drinking polluted water; it does not realize that public health is only the sum total of the individual healths, and that every avoidable injury to the public health means individual sufferings and losses which need not have been incurred. A few American states and cities have made some progress in the care of the public health; but the good work has been done chiefly by educated physicians and engineers serving gratuitously on boards of health. Such an organization is vastly better than none; but, as the results show, it is less efficient than the steady, paid service of such competent health-officers as all large European communities nowadays employ. Again we see that this recently created but important municipal function requires experts for its satisfactory performance.

VI. Another matter in which democratic government manifests, in comparison with aristocratic and autocratic governments, a curious neglect of the interests of the masses, is the provision, or rather lack of provision, of parks, gardens, open-air parlors, and forests for the enjoyment of the populace. This subject is closely connected with the last to which I referred,—the public health. One would have supposed, that, before the urban populations began to feel keenly their deprivation of fresh air and rural beauty, liberal reservations of unoccupied land would have been made in our country for the use of the public. The fact is, however, that European towns and cities,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

both large and small, are much better provided with parks, gardens, small squares, and popular open-air resorts of all kinds, than American towns and cities. The gardens, parks, and game-preserves of royalty and nobility have there been converted, in many cases, to popular uses with the happiest results. The largest and densest European cities—London, Vienna, Berlin, and Paris—are greatly better off in this respect than any American city. Even the least progressive parts of Europe, like Spain and Sicily, surpass the United States in making provision for the out-of-door enjoyments of crowded populations. All about our large cities and towns the building-up of neighborhoods once rural is going on with marvellous rapidity, and the city population is progressively excluded from private properties long unoccupied, but now converted into brick blocks and wooden villages, mostly unsightly. Meantime the municipalities take no measures to provide either small squares or broad areas for the future use of the people. Some of the smaller New England cities have actually hesitated to accept, or have even declined, the gift of valuable tracts which public-spirited citizens have offered them. A notion has been spread abroad by assessors and frugal citizens who prefer industrial or commercial values to spiritual and æsthetic or joy-giving values, that any area exempt from taxation is an incubus on the community; the fact being that the exempted areas in most towns and cities represent, as a rule, just those things which make a dense community worth having at all, namely, the churches, museums, libraries, hospitals, colleges, schools, parks, squares, and commons. One would infer from democratic practice, that in democratic theory public parks and gardens were made for the rich or the idle, whereas they are most needed by the laborious and the poor. The richer classes can provide their own enjoyments; they can go to the country or the sea when they please: it is the laboring masses that need the open-air parlor, the city boulevard, and the country park. The urban population in the United States has not yet grasped these principles; and herein lies one great difficulty in regard to good municipal administration in this matter. But there is another serious difficulty: the satisfactory construction and maintenance of public works of this nature require many years of steady work upon one plan, and they require both artistic and engineering skill in the officials who devise, execute, and maintain such works. Again we see that good municipal administration must, in this department also, be in the hands of competent experts, and that not for a year at a time, but for long periods.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I have now touched, I believe, on the chief municipal functions which have a distinctly scientific quality. There remain the administration of justice, the protection of the city against fire, disorder, and crime, and the conduct of the public schools. Experience has abundantly proved that independent and permanent tenures, after proper periods of probationary or subordinate service, are indispensable for the heads of all these departments of municipal administration; but these functions are less novel than those with which I have chiefly dealt, although even in these departments many new questions present themselves nowadays which never troubled at all the men of the last generation.

Of the judicial and legal departments of a great municipality it is perhaps unnecessary to say more than this,—that their efficiency depends on the steady employment of learned, independent, and honorable lawyers and judges. Of the education department I can say with confidence, that the welfare of the schools will always be best promoted by superintendents and teachers who have been selected by a professional appointing body, proved in actual service under the observation of competent inspectors, and then appointed to permanent places. Academies, endowed schools, and colleges often have better modes of selecting teachers than the public schools, and more secure tenures of office. Hence, in part, the greater comparative success of these institutions, their relative resources being considered. It is interesting to notice, that, under stress of great disasters, the fire department has become the best-managed public organization in an American city. In that department are often found all the features of an efficient service,—careful selection of the members of the force, steady employment, advancement for merit, compensation for injury, and a pension on retirement after faithful service.

I believe it is no exaggeration to say that good municipal administration has now become absolutely impossible without the employment, on permanent tenures, of a large number of highly trained and highly paid experts in various arts and sciences as directors of the chief city departments, and that the whole question of municipal reform is covered by the inquiry, How can a city government be organized so as to secure the services of these experts? Without attempting to go into the details of municipal organization, I venture to indicate the direction in which reform must be sought. Of late years the direction of reform movements has been towards increasing the responsibility of the mayor, by freeing him from the control of muni-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cipal elective bodies, and giving him larger rights of appointing and dismissing his subordinates. This method will succeed only so far as it procures for the city independent and highly trained expert service. I do not see that it tends to secure such service, unless the tenure of the mayoralty itself is prolonged and the heads of departments are made safe from arbitrary dismissal. On the whole, there is but slight tendency in the American cities to prolong the period of service of mayors. To give the mayor, who is himself a short-term official, larger powers of appointment and dismissal, does not tend to secure to the heads of departments long terms of service. Competent men will not leave their own business or the service of the numerous corporations which give useful men secure positions, to accept municipal positions the tenure of which is no longer, to say the least, than the tenure of the mayor. The inevitable result will be that the city will secure only second-, third-, or fourth-rate servants. As a rule, only incompetent people, or people out of work, or adventurers, will accept casual employment. I believe that all reform efforts ought to be primarily directed to the means of procuring under democratic government, as under aristocratic and autocratic governments, honest, highly trained, and well-paid permanent officials. The intelligent American closely resembles the intelligent European in preferring an independent and permanent position. He will always accept lower pay for a steady job. He will always prefer, when he has passed the speculative and adventurous age, a moderately paid position with which go public consideration and a prospect of steady usefulness, to higher paid but insecure positions. The method of employing competent persons in permanent positions is also more economical than any other: it procures more service, and more faithful and interested service, than any other method. The experience of many American corporations illustrates this fact. In the service of banks, trust companies, insurance companies, railroads, factories, shops, colleges, and hospitals, it is the almost universal practice to retain as long as possible well-proved managers, trained clerks, and skilful workmen. This policy is, indeed, the only profitable policy. In many towns and counties, also, the tenure of elective offices is practically a tenure during efficiency. For a cure of the evils which now attend democratic government in cities, it is of the utmost consequence that the methods of municipal service should be assimilated to the methods of the great private and corporate services which require intelligence, high training, and long experience. The doctrine

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of rotation in office when applied to such functions as I have been describing is simply silly.

I adverted at the opening of this paper to the fact that town governments in the United States have remained good, down to the present day, through all the deterioration of city governments. The principal reason for this fact seems to be that the best men in a rural town can undertake the service of the town without interfering with their regular occupation or business, and may derive from that service a convenient addition to their ordinary earnings. A selectman, road commissioner, or school commissioner in a New England town, has a position of respectability and local influence, with perhaps some small emolument; and he holds it without suffering any loss in his private business. In large cities, on the other hand, it is quite impossible for the chief officials to attend to their private business and at the same time to fulfil their municipal functions. Moreover, city men of capacity and character are sure to be absorbed in their own affairs so completely that they give but a reluctant and spasmodic attention to the business of the public. Democratic freedom inevitably tends to produce this devotion to their own affairs on the part of intelligent and industrious citizens. An able professional man, merchant, or manufacturer, cannot abandon his regular vocation to take municipal service, until his success in his profession or business has been so great that he can afford to impair, or dispense with, his ordinary annual earnings. Aside from persons of fortune and leisure, there are but two classes of competent and desirable men in this country who can, as a rule, enter the public service at all without sacrificing their individual and family interests. These two classes are lawyers, and business-men whose business is already so well organized that they can temporarily abandon it without incurring any loss which they care about. Of the Fifty-first Congress of the United States, nearly three-quarters are lawyers—fully three-quarters of the Senate, and nearly three-quarters of the House. Of the other quarter, the majority are business-men of the kind I have described. A lawyer returning from public service to his profession generally finds, if he is a man of ability, that his private practice has been increased. A manufacturer or merchant who is already rich can of course run the risks of the public service. If the voters abandon him, or his superior discharge him, he returns to his private business. As a rule, no other persons in the American community can really afford to enter the public service, either municipal or national, as it is at present conducted.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Before municipal government can be set right in the United States, municipal service must be made a life-career for intelligent and self-respecting young Americans; that is, it must be attractive to well-trained young men to who enter it,—as they enter any other profession or business,—meaning to stay in it, learn it thoroughly, and win advancement in it by fidelity and ability. To enforce this principle, to indicate this one necessary direction of all reform movements, has been my modest object in this paper. To say that this reform is impracticable is equivalent to saying that American cities cannot be well conducted; and that, again, is equivalent to saying that the democratic form of government is going to be a failure for more than half of the total population. Free institutions themselves are valuable only as a means of public well-being. They will ultimately be judged by their fruits; and therefore they must be made to minister fairly well to the public comfort, health, and pleasure, and to conform in their administrative methods to the standards of intelligence and morality which are maintained by other trustees and large business agencies in the same communities.

CHARLES W. ELIOT.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SOCIAL VERSE.

To improve on the collection or selection of poems issued years ago under the title of "*Lyra Elegantiarum*" * might have seemed impossible even for its editor: but Mr. Locker-Lampson has done so. In all such volumes a reader will usually find omissions to regret and insertions which surprise him: to take note of these is the best and sincerest tribute he can pay to the excellence of the general accomplishment—the fullest acknowledgment he can make of the high standard maintained and the happy success achieved. And when all necessary deductions on either score have been duly made and registered, it will remain evident to the capable reader that there is no better or completer anthology than this in the language: I doubt indeed if there be any so good and so complete. No objection or suggestion that can reasonably be offered can in any way diminish our obligation either to the original editor or to his evidently able assistant Mr. Kernahan in the compilation of a larger if not a more ambitious volume.

The crowning merit, the first and highest distinction of the book, is the fair if not yet quite adequate prominence given now for the first time to the name of the great man whose lightest and slightest claim to immortality is his indisputable supremacy over all possible competitors as a writer of social or occasional verse more bright, more graceful, more true in tone, more tender in expression, more deep in suggestion, more delicate in touch, than any possible Greek or Latin or French or English rivals. Meleager no less than Voltaire, and Prior no less than Catullus,† must on this ground give place to Landor. The editors, to their lasting honour, have put into their casket no less than thirty-eight of his flawless and incomparable jewels: but how came they to overlook a thirty-ninth yet lovelier than all? There is

* Lyra Elegantiarum: a Collection of Some of the Best Social and Occasional Verse by Deceased English Authors. Revised and Enlarged Edition. Edited by Frederick Locker-Lampson, assisted by Coulson Kernahan (Ward, Lock, and Co., London, New York, and Melbourne, 1891.)

† Such a poem as that on his old yacht would no doubt be the greatest example on record of such work, if it were not this and something more.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nothing in the volume, there is nothing in the language, comparable with the quatrain on Dirce in the boat of Charon.

Stand close around ye Stygian set,
With Dirce in one boat conveyed:
Or Charon, seeing, may forget
That he is old and she a shade.

And how comes it that we miss the exquisitely and nobly beautiful stanzas addressed to his "little household gods"? or the lovely song (as of a graver and more thoughtful Herrick) addressed to the cistus flower? or again, this gracefullest and sweetest of all compliments ever offered to a sweet and graceful English girl?

Nature! thou may'st fume and fret,
There's but one white violet:
Scatter o'er the vernal ground
Faint resemblances around,
Nature, I will tell thee yet
There's but one white violet.

It might doubtless be pleaded in extenuation of such editorial delinquencies or derelictions that a fairly adequate or representative selection from Landor's minor poems would probably have taken up half the volume: but what excuse can be offered for the omission of such a jewel as this?

Mother, I cannot mind my wheel;
My fingers ache, my lips are dry:
Oh! if you felt the pain I feel!
But oh, who ever felt as I!

No longer could I doubt him true:
All other men may use deceit;
He always said my eyes were blue,
And often swore my lips were sweet.

Low as is the key of these tenderer verses in comparison with the fiery and faultless music, the subtle and simple intensity of the four transcendent lines which suggested them, it seems to me that Sappho's very self might have smiled approval or at least condonation of their gentler loveliness and less passionate melody than her own.

The great name of Landor naturally and happily suggests the great name of Browning: and the beautiful "garden fancy" of the flower's Spanish name is worthy of its place in the highest class of such poems as are included in the scheme of this collection. But the greater poem of "Youth and Art" seems here to me at least, somewhat out of place. There is hardly a more tragic touch in all the most tragic passages of Mr. Browning's vast and various work than

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that which winds up with neither a smile nor a sigh, the unspoken expression of hopeless and inexpressible regret—

> And nobody calls you a dunce,
> And people suppose me clever:
> This could but have happened once,
> And we missed it, lost it for ever.

That is not a sample of social verse: it is an echo from the place of conscious or unconscious torment which is paved with penitence and roofed with despair. Its quiet note of commonplace resignation is more bitter and more impressive in the self-scornful sadness of its retrospect than any shriek of rebellion or any imprecation of appeal. And if elegance is the aim or the condition of this anthology, how comes it to admit such an unsurpassably horrible example of inelegance as the line—I refrain from quoting it—which refers to the "settling" of "Gibson's hash"?

The incomparable "Lost Mistress," that crowning flower or jewel of its author's treasure house or garden, was probably (and it may be rightly) found to be "just above the range of Occasional Verse" in its "aim and execution." But it is so delicately difficult to draw such a line between admission and rejection that the reader who misses and regrets this exquisite little poem will be surprised to find how far above the average of social or occasional verse are some of the lyrics admitted within a fold so exclusive. And such a reader will assuredly regret the admission into its catalogue of the name which is above every name on the roll of English lyrists. There should have been no place here for Coleridge. No "son of Adam" (as his satirical "interviewer" Mr. Carlyle would have said) can wish to see him represented by such flabby doggrel as might have dropped from the Tupper of America or the Longfellow of England. The adoring lovers of Christabel must surely be unanimous in their protest against the reappearance of her poet as the congratulatory apostrophist of Louisa dear—that lovely convalescent. Descending from the zenith to the nadir of serious lyric verse—from the name of Coleridge to the name of Moore, we find the bardling of Erin excellently well represented by at least one really charming little epigram ("When I loved you"): and the other specimens given of his talent are very fair ones. But to give a fair notion of that fresh and facile talent at its very best and brightest it would have been necessary as it might surely have been feasible, to borrow from Moore's still delightful masterpiece, the correspondence of the Fudge Family, some samples of an epistle or so

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

—enough perhaps to place once more on record the star-crossed loves of Miss Biddy Fudge and Colonel Calicot.

But it is at the opening of the book that the sins of omission or commission, the errors of indulgence or default are gravest and most regrettable.

Skelton is either too late or too early to begin with: and we look in vain for a ballad or a roundel of Chaucer's—less antiquated in form and not more obsolete in language than the rough and ready rhymes of Henry VIII.'s and Elinor Rummyng's poet laureate.

> Thanne seyde Love, "A ful grete necligence
> Was yt to the, that ylke time thou made
> 'Hyd Absolon thy tresses' in balade,
> That thou forgate hire * in thy song to sette."

Nor was it a less grave negligence to omit that lovely and melodious ballad from a volume of which it should have been one of the foremost ornaments. If Skelton's and Wyat's orthography may be modified or modernized, as assuredly it may without protest from any but the most horny-eyed and beetle-headed of pedants, so assuredly may Chaucer's.

And it would have been of some little service to the common cause of good poetry and sound criticism if the duncery which regards, or the impertinence which pretends to regard that beautiful form of verse as nothing better than a harmless exotic affectation of the present day or hour had been confronted with the fact that it is one of the numberless adaptations or adoptions from foreign models which our language owes to the father of modern English poetry. If the old French ballad form accepted by Chaucer so long before it attained its highest possible perfection of tragic or comic excellence, of humourous or pathetic expression, under the incomparable and inimitable touch of Villon, is to be either patronized or rejected as an exotic of hothouse growth and artificial blossom so must be the couplet, the stanza, the sonnet, the quatrain, and all other forms of rhyming verse in use among English poets from the days of Chaucer to the days of Wordsworth. But it is useless to insist on such simple and palpable truths; for ignorance will never understand that knowledge is attainable, and impotence will never admit that ability may be competent. "Do you suppose it is as easy to write a song as to write an epic?" said Béranger to Lucien Bonaparte. Nor would it be as

> * Alcestis; good Alceste,
> The daysie, and myn owene hertes reste.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

easy for a most magnanimous mouse of a Calibanic poeticule to write a ballad, a roundel, or a virelai, after the noble fashion of Chaucer, as to gabble at any length like a thing most brutish in the blank and blatant jargon of epic or idyllic stultiloquence.

The worst active or positive blemish—and a most fearful and shameful blemish it is—to be found in this generally graceful and careful collection will unluckily be found and cannot be overlooked on the fourth page: sixth on the list of selected poems is a copy of verses attributed to Shakespeare—of all men on earth!—by the infamous pirate, liar, and thief who published a worthless little volume of stolen and mutilated poetry patched up and padded out with dirty and dreary doggrel, under the senseless and preposterous title of "The Passionate Pilgrim." It is here more plausibly ascribed tho' on what authority I know not, to some scribbler—unknown to Shakespeare's contemporaries—who would seem to have signed himself Shakspere, and to have imagined that the gabble of geese or the chatter of apes was English and was verse.*

Happily there is here no second instance—but naturally there could not have been a second—of such amazing depravity in taste. If this execrable rubbish were cleared away there might remain some debatable points for respectful and friendly discussion between fellow-students of English poetry: there would be little if anything to provoke or to necessitate any vehemence of protest or appeal.

It is of course questionable, and I certainly cannot pretend to decide the question, whether a volume of social or occasional verse ought to include any examples of sacred poetry in its lighter and brighter form. But there are such exquisitely and daintily beautiful examples of such poetry in earlier and in later English verse that I cannot but regret their absence from a collection which includes a pervert's pietistic and Romanistic gush of sentimental religiosity over the poetry of a saner and a sounder devotee. If this sort of sanctified stuff is admissible with its fetid fragrance of priestly perfumery and its rancid relish of ecstatic or spasmodic excitement, why and how do we find not one single example of the many lovely songs which English poetry owes to an older and purer and wholesomer form of piety?

* *Ecce signum.* "My curtail dog—with sighs so deep procures (*sic*) to weep in howling wise, to see my doleful plight. How sighs resound through heartless ground, like a thousand vanquished men in bloody fight!" Whether the poor creature's affliction were idiocy or lunacy would have been a matter for science to resolve.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

He came all so still
  Where his mother was
As dew in Aprill
  That falleth on the grass.

He came all so still
  To his mother's bower
As dew in Aprill
  That falleth on the flower.

He came all so still
  Where his mother lay,
As dew in Aprill
  That falleth on the spray.

I cannot but think that such lines as these—unspeakable in their loveliness they seem to my poor judgment—would have been fitter for a place in such a collection as this than any effusion of "beastly Skelton" or sickly Crashaw. We do not indeed know that the author was an officially reverend poet or person: but even if he was but a secular songster, the fact remains that he has written the sweetest verses imaginable on a subject with which these two clerical writers could hardly have been trusted to deal by any one who might object to unfrocked rampant ribaldry or to Catholic and apostolic erethism.

The first great age of our lighter lyric poetry was almost conterminous with the one great age of our tragic and romantic drama. From the song-books of Shakespeare's generation alone an anthology as large and as precious as the collection now before us might easily and quickly be compiled. This golden branch of English poetry is here so inadequately represented by a casual twig or an occasional spray that we could hardly contradict a reader who might complain that it had been utterly ignored. At no date was there so splendid a supply of serious or semi-serious occasional verse—so general a community of delicate grace and noble elegance among the minor poets of the day. And the general tone of this poetry was more in accordance with the taste and the instinct of our own time than that of any social or fashionable verse from the Restoration to the Regency—at least. It is light and bright as spray in sunshine, but no less clean and sweet: neither stiff and fulsome with the starch and perfumery of courtly verse under the patronage of Charles I, nor gross and greasy with the reek of Whitefriars or Whitehall under the auspices of Charles II. And the best verse of Carew is impaired by the barber-like suggestion of "powders to enrich your hair:" and the finest song of the Restoration is inadmissible on account of its bitter and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cynical brutality. Perhaps, too, that famous lyric may have been rejected as merely a metrical variation on the Carthusian theme—"*Frère, il faut mourir.*" It is of course impossible, and very justly and properly impossible—on the whole—yet, considering one or two things admitted, I hardly see in spite of the obsolete slang and patriarchal vulgarity of the words "bit" (for girl) and "hogo" (for highly spiced dish) why this stanza should not have found place among others detached from their context which have been accepted as admissible.

> Your most beautiful bit, that has all eyes upon her,
> Who her honesty sells for a hogo of honour,
> *Whose lightness and brightness doth shine, in such splendour,*
> *That none but the stars are thought fit to attend her,*
> Though now she be pleasant and sweet to the sense
> Will be damnably mouldy a hundred years hence.

It must have been a terrible Triboulet or Thersites who turned such an eye as the writer of these verses must have turned on the foundresses of ducal houses whose flourishing expansion bears witness to the charms and to the venality of a French or an English prostitute.

But though we may neither regret nor wonder at the exclusion of the grimmest and greatest of all erotic and Bacchanalian sermons in song, we may be allowed to regret that the two typical figures of the Restoration in its influence on lyric poetry should be rather inadequately than insufficiently represented. Dryden the greatest and most various representative of his age at its best and at its worst, is not for a moment comparable as a song-writer to Lord Rochester or to Mrs. Behn. And neither the plebeian poetess who sleeps in Westminster Abbey beside Abraham Cowley and Robert Browning (Poets' Corner—facetiously so-called—is like poverty in its capacity for bringing strange bedfellows together), nor the patrician poet who divides with her the potential palm of supremacy in obscenity among all remembered writers of their race, is here represented by the best examples that might have been given of their abused and wasted genius. Like Marcus Cato's or Joseph Addison's Marcia "the virtuous Aphra towers above her sex" in the passionate grace and splendid elegance of that melodious and magnificent song ("Love in fantastic triumph sat") to which Leigh Hunt alone among critics has ever done justice—and has done no more than justice in the fervour of his impassioned panegyric. This would have been in every way a better and more appropriate example of her poetic power than the rather pretty, very proper, but rather feeble verses by which it is here

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

misrepresented. But misrepresentation has been the lot of the virtuous Aphra ever since her hallowed dust gave additional consecration to the Pantheon of British bards—a Pantheon too exclusive to admit such godlings as Shakespeare or Milton, Coleridge or Wordsworth, Landor or Keats or Shelley. Anthony Trollope in his exquisitely comical and conscientiously coxcombical autobiography, observes with contemptuous unction that he "never read more detestable trash than the stories written by Mrs. Aphra Behn:" and all readers of Lockhart will remember that Sir Walter Scott's "gay old grand-aunt" found it impossible to get through the very first of the stories which she had requested him to send her, remembering the pleasure with which in her girlhood she had heard them read aloud in the most decorous and refined society. The only one I remember to have ever read might, as far as I remember, be reprinted in company with Mrs. Beecher Stowe's and Lady Emily Hornblower's effusions of fiction or of song on behalf of "the irrepressible nigger." The tragic and pathetic story of Oroonoko does only less credit to her excellent literary ability than to the noble impulse of womanly compassion and womanly horror which informs the whole narrative and makes of it one ardent and continuous appeal for sympathy and pity, one fervent and impassioned protest against cruelty and tyranny.

The immaculate Calvinism of so fiery and so forcible a champion of slave-holding and slave-torture as Mr. Carlyle shows hardly to advantage beside the instinctive Christianism of a writer whose reputation is certainly very far from immaculate: and when Mr. Homer Wilbur, after citing "a play of Mrs. Behn's," excused himself for having done so by the reflection that "even these kennels of literature may yield a fact or two to pay the raking," so ardent an advocate of emancipation as the late Mr. Lowell might have remembered that this improper woman of genius was the first literary abolitionist —the first champion of the slave on record in the history of fiction; in other words, in the history of creative literature.

Whigs and Puritans have brought many charges and laid many impeachments against the Restoration: Tories and Jacobites have had to allow that there was but too much ground for too many of them: Scott and Macaulay are found for once in agreement on certain points regarding the literary and political record of that singular period. Two of its offences, in my humble opinion, are specially and supremely unpardonable: the humiliation of the English before the Dutch—an infamy unparalleled in our history till the advent into

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

power of a party beside which even The Cabal itself seems something less than infamous—and the moral murder of so rare a genius as Rochester's. Victims of vanity and lechery are seldom worth regret: but this hapless pupil of the Puritans, hounded as he was by false shame and foolish emulation into such inconceivable eccentricities of literary and personal debauchery, was born for so different a fate and so different a record, had not his evil star intervened to thwart it, that no one who realizes what he might and should have been can ever think of the poet or the man without a thrill or a pang of pity. The gallant young volunteer who distinguished himself even among English sailors and soldiers as the hero of a sea-fight drank himself into cowardice, and truckled to a challenger as a Russo-Radical of our own day would truckle to any enemy who might assist him in the degradation of his country: the noble and thoughtful poet who might have beaten all competitors * out of the field became such a rhymester as Plato might have excepted from the sentence of expulsion—surely in other cases a superfluous sentence—pronounced against poets who might find themselves within the limits of a republic from which Platonic love had excluded the superfluous and obsolete influence of woman.

But it is somewhat hard that he should not have the benefit of his genius at its best: and though the two samples of it given here are good enough to be set beside those given of Sir Charles Sedley's—a genuine but inferior humourist and poet, not quite so deeply tainted by the "fat pollutions" of their time—they are not nearly so good as a light and tender and harmless love-song which has found place in other collections and should not have been excluded from this.

The austerest or most knowing of young persons will hardly feel the blush of virtue mount to the cheek of discretion on reading the samples given from these writers of ill fame: but one of those given from a greater author (tho' assuredly not from a greater poet) of the next generation might not inconceivably succeed in producing that cosmetic effect. Congreve's lines on Chloe are excellent in their way, but if the impudent grace of epigram is to excuse or to extenuate its graceless impudence, why should the more famous and hardly more audacious lines on Doris be excluded? It would perhaps have been better, I am puritanical and prudish enough to think, if this

* Dryden as controversialist and satirist, could of course have had no competitor; but there is I must repeat a purer lyrical note in Rochester's best verse than in the best of his.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

great name had been here represented only by the not more faultless than blameless verses on fair Amoret—a model of delicate and high-bred satire.

There is no more unaccountable omission in this volume than that of Pope's little pearl of price—

> I know a thing that most uncommon—
> (Envy, be silent, and attend !)

The exquisite simplicity of this lyrical compliment—*simplex munditiis* if ever a poem was—makes of it a gem of even finer water than any here given from the hand of the same jeweller.

With Prior no poet could well have gone wrong, and Mr. Locker-Lampson has gone admirably and inevitably right. But the perfection of taste and tact displayed in the discharge of such a task as the presentation of Swift at his best, and of Swift in the fullness of his powers, to the modern reader of either sex and any possible age—and this without hint or suspicion of offence—is notable alike for simplicity, for dexterity and for daring. Two poems in which the genius of Aristophanes shakes hands with the genius of Dickens,—for Swift has revived the one and anticipated the other in his exquisite abuse of language and his delicious perversion of proper names—"Hamilton's Bawn" and "Mrs. Harris's Petition," are now, by the slightest and most delicate of touches, made accessible to all lovers of the rarest humour and the most resplendent wit: we only miss Mary the cookmaid's not less wonderful and delightful letter to Dr. Sheridan. In that instance there would have been no need of any excision: but had there been we might gratefully and confidently have entrusted the part of Bowdler to the instinctive good sense, the manly and rational delicacy, of the present editors. That this should ever be a thankless part to play in any case of obvious or apparent necessity reflects less than little credit on the taste and judgment of those whose objections or whose ridicule would make it so. More nauseous and more foolish cant was never chattered than that which would deride the memory or depreciate the merits of Bowdler, no man ever did better service to Shakespeare than the man who made it possible to put him into the hands of intelligent and imaginative children; it may well be if we consider how dearly the creator of Mamillius must have loved them, that no man has ever done him such good service. Indeed, I could wish to borrow the pencil or the pen which struck out of his text whatever was unfit for such readers, and strike out of the volume before me an insignificant if not a too significant pastoral

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

on the interview of a faithful young Thyrsis with his dear Lucy, and the Greuze-like lyric which celebrates the misadventure of an Irish Mlle. de la Cruche-cassée. These two, it seems to my possibly too squeamish and censorious apprehension, would find their more appropriate place in a *Lyra Facetiarum*. Or if such as these be found admissible, I hardly see by what critical canon of æsthetics or of ethics we can be bound or free to pass sentence of exclusion against a poem so far superior to these as Nat Lee's most musical and most graceful bridal song, "Blush not redder than the morning."

But even when the real or imaginary merits of the pseudo-pastoral school are—in the immortal phrase of Mr. Podsnap—combined with an absence of anything calculated to bring a blush to the cheek of a young person a poem of that school is very seldom worthy of such promotion as is here accorded, for instance, to the stale and silly doggrel of such songsters as Garrick. One of the obscurest among his contemporaries—Richard Jago, the admiring friend of Shenstone—has supplied two little stanzas worth a bushel of Strephoniana! their pretty simplicity and instinctive sincerity of accent are more exceptionally remarkable than their happy point and neatness of terse expression. And from Peter Pindar, of all writers in the world, we get a really graceful and almost pathetic touch ("the wounded tree Is all that will remember me") by way of close to a song (by a person of no quality) in the mild Arcadian style.

The lyrical genius of Collins* and of Blake, our two greatest poets of the century in which they were born, flies usually too high in air too clear and splendid for the highest flight possible to merely elegant verse of the occasional sort: yet I can hardly think it would have been presumptuous or unbecoming to glorify this volume by the inclusion of two poems so conspicuous for their exaltation of elegance in style no less than of delicacy or tenderness in fancy as the melodious lament for Fidele and the majestic address to the Muses.

Opinion and taste will be likelier or more certain to vary among students and lovers of occasional verse as their study brings them nearer their own time. There is certainly much to commend, as there is also not a little to regret, in the very miscellaneous selection here given from the social poetry of the nineteenth century. What first struck the present reader on glancing thro' it was the too obvious and damaging fact that there was by no means enough of Peacock to so much of Praed. Even in social verse as defined by Mr. Austin

* I mean of course the poet of that name.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Dobson and the "Times" reviewer who has the honour to be cited in the preface to this pleasant volume we look—at its very best—for more spirit and versatility of life, more warmth of touch, more fullness of tone, more vigour and variety of impulse than we find in Praed at his. After reading, with sincere pleasure and real admiration, two or three of those charming little pieces whose genuine and high-bred elegance is most evidently inimitable when confronted with the servile vulgarity of their more abject and impotent imitators, we are nevertheless conscious that this gracefullest and readiest of performers has after all but one string to his fiddle. The riper and richer humour of Peacock, as superior to Praed's as dry champagne to sweet, or a Sultana grape to a green gooseberry, is excellently well represented by the masterly and generous satire of "Rich and Poor, or Saint and Sinner," his deeper and sweeter gift of grave and tender song, by the matchless elegiac idyl of "Youth and Age." But how came the editors to throw away for the second time—repeating the unhappy exploit of the diving friar—"the stone of all stones, the philosopher's stone"? And how could they ignore the incomparable raiding song which registers for all time the difference between mountain sheep and valley sheep? And if, in the teeth of a promise given or an engagement implied in the preface, a place was to be found for such mean and pitiful parodies as disfigure two or three of these pages, how on earth did they come to overlook the quintessence of Byron as distilled by Peacock into the two consummate stanzas which utter or exhale the lyric agony of Mr. Cypress?

Byron himself is not badly represented by the famous parting address to Tom Moore and still better by the spirited bluster and vigorous ring of the stanzas on the Lisbon Packet: though even as here modified (by the not very plausible substitution, for instance, of a heathen for a sacred name, and a "hang" for a big big D) their elegance is not quite so evident as their rollicking energy of improvisation or the swinging dance and suggestive roll of the happily appropriate metre. If, like Shelley's Peter Bell, I may borrow an illustration from far off memories of otherwise barren hours passed principally in profound inattention to lectures on Aldrich's Logic, I would suggest that, as coarseness is contrary, vulgarity is contradictory to elegance just as in politics the monarchical principle is contrary, but the principle—if any such principle there be—of disunionism, dissolutionism, or communalism (barbarous terms expressive of a barbarous impolicy) is contradictory to the republican principle.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Coarseness of a certain kind is as compatible—witness much Greek, much Latin, much French, much Italian and a little English poetry—with literary elegance of a certain kind as the monarchical form with the republican principle which makes even royalists talk of the commonwealth of England: vulgarity of any kind is as incompatible with elegance of any kind as is the republican principle with the disintegrating instinct of Parisian anarchists or Irish reactionaries: and he who could reconcile these would assuredly and easily

Make the inexorable asymptote close like fond lips.*

Dryden, for example, is very often coarse: but Dryden is very seldom vulgar. Byron is seldom very coarse: but Byron is often very vulgar. It is the difference between the generation whose ideal type was Rochester and the generation whose ideal type was Brummell.

The melodious stanzas to Augusta might surely have found here a place—with or without the closing verses (unaccountably omitted from the current editions of Byron) which are hardly necessary to explain and justify the enthusiastic admiration of that most exquisite critic Edgar Poe for the metrical perfection of that most mellifluous poem—usually and prematurely broken off short after the fourth of the following sweet lines.

In the desert a fountain is springing,
In the wide waste there still is a tree,
And a bird in the solitude singing
Which speaks to my spirit of thee.

Thou thought'st verses like these could be scanned—which
Was absurd, but uncommonly kind:
Thou said'st each stanza was not a sandwich
Of blank prose and rank doggrel combined:
Thou found'st out some strange sort of sweet fitness
In the rhythms mauled and mangled by me:
And such ears, I take Midas to witness,
Belong but to donkeys and thee.

Parodies, we are given to understand in the preface, have been generally rejected as alien from the scope of this work. Even had they been generally accepted as germane to it, we should hardly have expected to come across anything so pert and poor as Miss Fanshawe's abortive imitation of Wordsworth—a poet who seems easier to parody than he is, and has never to my knowledge been successfully caricatured or burlesqued except perhaps once by Landor.

Speaking of Wordsworth, by the way, I must take occasion to express my wonder and regret at missing that most gracious and delight-

* Sydney Dobell: "Balder."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ful poem, "The Kitten and the Falling Leaves:" which would here have been doubly acceptable, as one of the finest and most appropriate that could possibly have been chosen to enhance the value of such a collection, and as a natural companion for Joanna Baillie's only less charming address "To a Kitten," here given in condensed or concentrated form.

But what, in the name of the Graces! what shall be said when we come across—of all dreary horrors on this God's earth!—a cockney music-hall sort of parody on Poe's everlasting "Raven"! Surely this is the very nadir of inelegance. Almost as bad and almost as vulgar is Hood's burlesque of Moore: indeed, except for the ever delightful and admirable verses "composed at Rotterdam," Hood is only less inadequately and unfavourably represented than Barham. There is certainly not too little, as the editors seem to think, of the monstrously overrated and preposterously overpraised C. S. Calverley: a jester, graduate or undergraduate, may be fit enough to hop, skip and tumble before university audiences, without capacity to claim an enduring or even a passing station among even the humblest of English humourists. Even more out of place in such good company is the weary and wearisome laureate of Oxonicules and Bostonicules, the late Mr. Lowell's realised ideal and chosen representative of English poetry at its highest in the generation of Tennyson and Browning. Literary history will hardly care to remember or to register the fact that there was a bad poet named Clough, whom his friends found it useless to puff: for the public, if dull, has not quite such a skull as belongs to believers in Clough.

A poet of a very different order, and of taste perhaps too reckless and style too defiant of academic regulation and culture, might have been more happily represented by two most graceful little posthumous poems, "Amy's Cruelty" and "May's Love," than by that rather sour sample of womanly jocularity called "A Man's Requirements," or by the much too serious and sentimental "Romance of the Swan's Nest." The compilers of the volume may very naturally have been tempted to strain a point so as to admit some specimen from the hand of the most potent if by no means the most perfect of English poetesses: but in that case they would have done much better, in my humble opinion, to select the beautiful and simple memorial stanzas so light and soft in movement, so grave and tender in emotion, which give so perfect and so sweet a picture of the typical English girl whom Mrs. Browning has made lovable and memorable for ever as My Kate.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The reader who comes in the list of contents upon the illustrious name of Edward Fitzgerald will doubtless be not a little taken aback when confronted with a bearer of that name so ludicrously and lamentably unworthy to be the namesake of the man whose shy audacity of diffident and daring genius has given Omar Khayyám a place for ever among the greatest of English poets. That the very best of his exquisite poetry, the strongest and serenest wisdom, the sanest and most serious irony, the most piercing and the profoundest radiance of his gentle and sublime philosophy, belong as much or more to Suffolk than to Shiraz, has been, if I mistake not, an open secret for many years—"and," as Dogberry says, "it will go near to be thought so shortly." Every quatrain, tho' it is something so much more than graceful or distinguished or elegant, is also, one may say, the sublimation of elegance, the apotheosis of distinction, the transfiguration of grace: perfection of style can go no further and rise no higher, as thought can pierce no deeper and truth can speak no plainer, than in the crowning stanza which of course would have found itself somewhat out of place beside even the gravest and the loftiest poem (Mrs. Barbauld's immortal lines on life, old age, and death) admitted or admissible into such a volume as this.

> Oh Thou, who man of baser earth didst make,
> And who with Eden didst devise the Snake,
> For all the sin wherewith the face of man
> Is blackened, man's forgiveness give—and take!

It is of work like this that his countrymen will always think when they hear the immortal name of the workman: and none will ever confound its author with the puny second hand rhymester,* whose cheap and chirrupping doggrel is almost as much beneath the lowest as any quatrain of Omar is above the highest level of such verse as we expect to find in such company as the present.

Another great name here somewhat wofully misrepresented is that of Thackeray; whose "White Squall" is now and then rather too provocative of such emotions as nature's might provoke in the digestive economy of a bad sailor. To make the gorge rise at it is hardly the sign or the property of elegance in verse: and if indecency, which means nothing more than unseemliness, is very properly considered as a

* But that his highly respectable name or names would appear to have been William Thomas I should assuredly have taken this Edward to be the Fitzgerald to whom—at secondhand—we owe the statement and the solution of the historic problem—"Who fills the butchers' shops with large blue flies?"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

reason for excluding from elegant society the most brilliant examples of the most illustrious writers ever touched by so much as a passing shade of it the rule should be applied equally to every variety of the repulsive and the unbecoming—not by any means only to matters of sexual indecorum and erotic indelicacy. To none of the other selections from the lighter work of the same illustrious hand is any such objection or suggestion applicable: but not one of them shews Thackeray at his very best as a comic poet. "The Battle of the Baltic" and "The Battle of the Shannon" are two masterpieces of lyric narrative, the one triumphant in tragedy, the other transcendent in comedy: each of them supreme, inimitable, matchless, and unmatchable of its kind for ever. Immortality beyond the reach of any other or later Hibernian who has ever sought or found his last refuge in patriotism is assuredly the lot of "Immortal Smith O'Brine" and "Young Meagher of the Sword:" O for one hour of their poet! we might exclaim—if we had not with us so admirable a substitute and so competent a rival in patriotic humour and lyric laughter of witty loyalty as Mr. Graves,—to sing for us the veracity of and purity of a Parnell, the pusillanimous magnanimity or the servile indignation of O'Briens far meaner and more ludicrous than poor Smith! This delicious little masterpiece cannot evidently have been excluded as a sample of the "satirical or political squibs" which, if we may believe the preface, "have been generally rejected:" or how comes it that we find admitted the less brilliant and more polemical squibs or crackers exploded by the philocatholic whiggery of Macaulay and Tom Moore? These, however, might be allowed to pass as undoubtedly successful in a thinner and more ephemeral style of satire: but surely the worse than hackneyed jocularity of the "Anti-Jacobin," however excellent of its rough and ready kind, is here most vilely out of place. It is something above and beyond all realized conceptions of incongruity to hoist the flag of "no politics" and pass the watchword of "no parodies" and then to salute the reader with a broadside of brutality and burlesque, a discharge of mildewed mockery and fly-blown caricature from the social or political battery of Messrs. Canning & Frere. And what delicious aberration of tasteless caprice can possibly have suggested the admission of a doggrel epithalamium by Croker—of all scribblers on record!—into the very last niche of this radiant and harmonious gallery of song? "You have a great name of your own"—"But I may be allowed to confess"—here is proper lyric stuff to wind up with! There is a due conformity of cadence and of style in these twenty villainous lines which should

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have sufficed to exclude them from any collection above the literary level of an old annual—"Gem," "Keepsake," or "Souvenir." O Sminthian Apollo! what a malodorous mouse to nail up on the hinder door of such a gracious little chapel, under the very nose as it were of the departing choir!

Were but this unutterably miserable rubbish once duly struck out and swept away the close of a beautiful volume would be beautiful and appropriate beyond all praise or thanks.

There are loftier sonnets in the language, there is no lovelier sonnet in the world, than the late Lord Rosslyn's "Bed-time." "It gives a very echo to the seat where love is throned"—the painless and stainless love of little children. Landor might and would, for all his fantastic and factitious abhorrence of their form, have given a place to this divine sonnet and its coequal companion in a truly blessed immortality, Mr. Tennyson-Turner's on "Letty's Globe," in his list of exceptions to the common rule or the conventional axiom which denies that any work of man's can ever be absolutely perfect. A volume closing upon verses so divine as these would be closed by every reader with a sense of fragrance in his nostrils and of honey on his tongue. I trust and think it is no mere prejudice of sympathetic or patriotic prepossession which rather impels than inclines me to believe that such a close would have been less characteristically appropriate to any such anthology of this especial kind as might have been gathered from the very sweetest and sunniest garden of any other language and any other poetry than our own.

ALGERNON CHARLES SWINBURNE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A PLAN FOR A PERMANENT BANK SYSTEM.

THE time has arrived, when, by common consent, a very decided change must be made in the volume and control of the circulating money of the United States. The greenback craze and the free-silver mania may or may not have run their courses; but, be that as it may, they both point to changes which must be made before the spirit of currency-unrest will be quieted. The printing of legal-tender notes, with no limit but the sweet will of the average congressman, goaded to extreme action by the ever-pressing demand for more money which reaches him from possibly the least thoughtful but most exacting of his constituents, opens up a vision of inflation in volume and of contraction in value which recalls like a nightmare the French assignat, which finally reached a circulation equal to $72 for every man, woman, and child, while its value declined until it required $1,500 to buy a pair of boots, and $150 to pay for a pound of butter. The Argentine Republic experiments of the last few years are still before us, and the world has scarcely ceased to shake with the financial earthquake they brought,—an explosion which threatened Great Britain with bankruptcy, and which has left in our own financial life a multitude of wrecks.

All human experience proves that a paper money controlled solely by the will of a legislature, and issued under the lash of an ever varying public opinion, has in it none of the qualities which fit it for a measure of value or a vehicle of exchange. If any thoughtful people have not reached this conclusion, their number is small, and it is to be hoped that their influence will always be insignificant.

The next plan, the one under nearly continuous discussion for several years, is to supply the people with a metallic currency, of which silver, to be coined in unlimited quantities, is the important factor. This is open to more objection, perhaps, than a legal-tender paper circulation. Those who have taken the pains to study the history of bimetallism in our own country and in Europe have discovered that two metals of varying intrinsic value can be kept in free circulation, side by side, only by limiting the coinage of the cheaper.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is very clear to experienced people (and among competent authorities there is substantial union in the opinion) that we have been of late approaching the danger-line with startling speed. To-day no man can with certainty say how long we may travel in our present course without meeting the shock of disaster and the earthquake of bankruptcy which must follow the expulsion from business channels of $600,000,000 of gold, now a most useful, serviceable, and conserving part of our currency system. The only honest and unselfish man who can contemplate without dread the consequences of an unlimited coinage of silver dollars worth twenty-five per cent less than the standard (gold) dollar is he who knows nothing of the nature of money, who has never mastered the rudiments of the law of coinage, who is ignorant of the experience of nations, and unacquainted with the infallible operation of Gresham's law. There is of course a small body of competent, skilful men who favor the free coinage of a debased measure of value; but they are men who have a selfish interest in the matter, and who reason, that, if the protected manufacturer under the tariff fallacies of the past thirty years has been enabled by law to compel his neighbor to pay him a dollar for sixty or seventy cents' worth of his product, the producer of silver bullion should have the same right to force everybody else to give him a dollar in exchange for his seventy-five cents' worth of silver. The people, however, are awakening to the folly of continued submission to tariff robbery, and as their eyes open they have little difficulty in seeing that free silver is only another method of reducing the value of deposits in savings banks, an effective way of cutting down pensions twenty-five per cent, and generally of fleecing the whole people for the personal profit of a handful of silver-mine owners, bullion producers, and speculators. The position of the free-silver advocates is still better understood when we recall the fact that they do not demand its coinage at its present market or intrinsic value, but ask that they be allowed what it was worth in 1792, 1834, or 1872. It is as if the vender of potatoes in this year of grace should call upon the government for a law compelling all potato-eaters to pay him two dollars a bushel for his twenty-five cent potatoes, because, forsooth, they sold at that high price once or twice during the last decade.

The only other way suggested of increasing the currency and of replacing the national-bank-note circulation (which the payment of government bonds must soon render extinct) is that of Senator Sherman, which has recently been telegraphed through the country. I re-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fer to his proposal, during his conference with Secretary Foster, to have the government issue treasury-notes to the banks on the deposit of bullion. This can hardly be the well-considered plan of a man of his recognized ability; but, if it is, it will not recommend itself, as it carries no promise of efficiency, and is minus the element of profit and self-interest for the banks which could alone make it successful. It requires no prophet to predict its failure in advance, or to foretell that it would simply invite an irresistible clamor for free coinage so soon as its failure was recognized. We may as well recognize the fact, that, if the currency is to be increased in volume in a way which will be either safe or just, neither of these three methods can be followed, for none of them calls for approval, either upon the score of efficiency, safety, or equity.

Another way to reach the end must be sought and found. It may not be amiss, however, to say here that it is far from unlikely that our present circulation of about $25 *per capita* is amply large for our needs, for it is nearly one-half greater than that of the most prosperous nation in the world. And if the methods of doing business and the volume of business done are both considered, as of course they should be, then we have now more money in circulation, in proportion to our needs, than any people in the world. France, Holland, Australia, Cuba, and the Argentine Republic have a larger *per capita* circulation than the United States; but if the actual value of their money, and the volume of business done with it, and the methods under which it is transacted, are studied, it will be found that our *per capita* circulation is relatively by far the largest in the world. Our currency system, too, is remarkable in the excellent feature, that, up to this time at least, we have managed to keep all our various forms of money at a parity with each other. Whether or not we plead the "baby act" for Americans when we clamor for more money than even the least competent nations find necessary, is left for the reader to determine.

The purpose of this article is to present a plan for the enlargement and extension of the banking system, and, besides providing for its perpetuation, to supply a method by which the circulating money of the country can also be safely increased in amount. As currency makes only eight per cent of our exchanges, and checks, drafts, bank-credits, and facilities provide the means for transacting the remaining ninety-two per cent of the business of the country, it is very clear that the volume of actual money, whether it is in coin or paper, is quite a secondary consideration. The first need is to provide credit facilities

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and to maintain the measure or standard of value, which, with us and all other enlightened countries, is gold.

Some idea of the value of banks may be fairly drawn from the simple illustration of a river. A great river carries the commerce of a state or a nation on its bosom, and yet it is made up of thousands of streams, fed by perhaps millions of springs, none of them able alone to float a shingle. In like manner, a bank gathers in small and scattered sums of the idle money, made up of savings and earnings, and, uniting them in its vaults, makes them available in loans, and with them keeps the business of a district going and the wheels of industry revolving. The good which will be done by the adoption of a system which will multiply and increase our banking facilities, and plant them more thickly, especially through the region west of the Mississippi and south of the Ohio, cannot be overstated.

The plan herein unfolded has been with the writer a hobby of many years' standing, one which has had, like others, to be often overhauled, altered, amended, and recast. It is presented here, rather than to Congress, in order to insure for it a hearing free from prejudice, and to avoid the heat of partisan criticism, which has only too often delayed, and sometimes entirely blocked the way of, useful reforms. The plan in its present shape meets the cordial approval of all of the many competent persons to whom it has been submitted. The supreme test of that feature upon which the security of circulating notes depends is that of application; and it is conclusive to say that, had the security it provides been for twenty-five years the sole and only basis for the national-bank-note circulation of the United States, neither the nation nor the noteholder would have lost a penny in the entire quarter of a century, and there is no reason to fear, that, if the plan should become law, any such loss would occur within the next century. The currency it proposes to supply will not only be safe and stable in value, but it will be ample in quantity, and will remove from the arena of discussion and the halls of Congress the question of currency supply. It provides also—imperfectly, it is true, but better than any previous method—the machinery by which the money of the country may be rendered more elastic and flexible; for, owing in part to two features in it, we shall come nearer than ever before to having two dollars in circulation when we need them, and only one when that suffices. It will not be a just criticism to say that this desirable end is not accomplished perfectly, unless at the same time it is noted that it is at least done better than ever before. Another valuable

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

feature in the plan is, that the increase of the currency it provides for will not, as unlimited silver coinage would, drive other money of any kind out of circulation: on the contrary, every dollar of money issued under this system would be a distinct and positive addition to the circulation of the country. Instead, too, of making the labor of maintaining the intelligent world's standard (gold) more and more difficult for the government, it would practically lift that entire burden from the nation's shoulders, and place it upon the back of the banking system, where it would be a light and easy load. The system proposed will not be costly and burdensome to the government, but, on the contrary, will pour a large revenue into the public treasury. It will be seen that the tax upon circulation, for which it provides, is equal to the entire interest which mistaken enthusiasts propose to have paid to the government as interest upon the loans which they demand it shall make to the farmers. How liberally it proposes to make the banks pay for the privilege of issuing perfectly secured notes, in this way meeting all the legitimate needs of every class of our people, will be understood when it is known that it provides for the highest tax on circulation paid by any banks in the commercial world, being about twice what the national banks now pay, and ten times as much as is paid by the Imperial Bank of Germany. It cannot therefore be urged, by either the honest man or the demagogue, that it would endow the banks with a privilege for which they would make no adequate return. This additional income, too, is greatly needed by the government.

Pardon is asked for again referring to the matter of the security of the notes. It is of the same character, but more carefully guarded, as that in which Massachusetts authorizes her savings banks to invest the savings of the poor; and her conservatism is a matter of common remark and approval. The security, in fact, for the note circulation proposed, will be the best in use anywhere; for when the responsibility of the stockholders back of it is taken into the account, and the average money reserves of the banks are added, it may truthfully be said that no other bank-notes in the world will be as perfectly secured as these. Unlike the security now given for national bank-notes, it would always be obtainable, and hence the system may be perpetual. Instead, therefore, of having a banking system, as now, which is constantly threatened with extinction (through the payment of the national debt of the United States), we should have one which would last for centuries, and which would meanwhile be capable of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the constant development required to keep pace with a growing country and an increasing business. There is nothing in the plan which throws it open to the charge of class legislation, for its provisions permit the location of banks in any and every section of the country. And any citizen can become a stockholder, for, if desired, the shares of the banks could be reduced to one dollar, five dollars, or any other fraction of one hundred dollars, thus making it very easy for even the poorest to become interested and to share any advantages which it may be supposed the law confers.

It will be found also that the plan proposes to permit the establishment of local or state banks alongside the national banks in all States where they are desired, and provides for a state-bank circulation as amply secured and as free from the taint of irredeemability as the national bank-notes now in circulation. It also provides, through these state banks, the facilities for a rapid increase in the volume of their notes, and therefore adds another elastic element to the money supply of the country. The state banks would contribute at the same rate to the public treasury as would the national; and the existence of the two systems alongside of each other would stimulate a most healthy rivalry in management and supervision; each local or state government naturally rivalling the general government and those of sister-states in the rigid supervision and control of her banks.

The great difficulty in getting action upon such an important measure as this is the tendency to throw it into politics; and if it becomes the football of partisanship, the country may be kept from the enjoyment of its provisions for a generation: whereas, if it simply meets that intelligent and business-like criticism which any important commercial measure should receive, and is approved, it will be adopted, and within a short time every section of the country and all branches of business will be enjoying its advantages, and millions of new money worth the full value of its face in gold will be flowing in the channels of trade. It would probably, it is true, be considered a Democratic measure, and the country would therefore in the future regard the Democratic party as its benefactor, and come to look upon it again as a conservative and intelligent abettor of trade, and the friend of legitimate enterprises of all kinds, instead of an organization to be dreaded, because prone to take up and help forward schemes that menace trade, commerce, and the prosperous course of business, as it has unfortunately done in connection with the greenback craze and other unsafe financial measures.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This would be no just reason for Republican opposition. Republicans should remember that the national banking system, from which they have as a party derived great advantages, is after all but an adaptation, involving few changes, of the Democratic banking systems which Mr. Chase and his friends found in existence in Indiana, Ohio, and New York in 1862. No more claim can be justly made that Mr. Chase and those about him created the national banking law than could be made by the writer for his connection with the establishment of the system herein proposed, should it become the law, for it makes at least as many and quite as vital changes in the existing system as the Republicans made in the system they found in successful operation at the beginning of the great war of 1861. Honors, indeed, between the two parties, in the line of banking services, are about equal, and both can well afford at this time to engage in a patriotic rivalry in seeing which can do the most to bring about the change needed.

The writer has no selfish interest in the result, beyond that of the average citizen, for he is neither stockholder nor officer in any national bank, and only takes advantage of the recent currency discussion to bring forward a system of banking which he has had under way for over a dozen years, and upon which he has tried to bring to bear the experience, study, and observation of twenty-nine years as bank clerk, private banker, bank officer, and manufacturer. The plan itself is brief and simple, and its very brevity is the excuse for so full an introduction. It is not contended that, if adopted, changes and improvements in it will not be necessary from time to time; but it is put forth in the belief that it is a remedy which will promptly cure the financial ills we suffer from, and that its adoption is free from danger, and beyond valid objection.

The somewhat numerous notes in small type are intended to answer questions which will naturally arise in the mind of the reader, and to point out whys, wherefores, and probable results, which would not, perhaps, at once occur to him. The basis we start with is the national banking system as it exists, and only the changes described are proposed. The rest of the present law would remain intact.

I. The list of bonds acceptable as security for circulating notes should be enlarged so as to include state, county, city, and railroad bonds under the following rules:—

Street-railroad bonds are excluded, because their franchises are usually of short duration; and bonds secured by mortgage upon farms and other real estate have always proved inferior and usually unsafe security for bank-notes.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(*a*) All bonds thus rendered available must be registered, and the principal and interest must be payable in gold of the present standard of weight and fineness.

There are enough bonds of this kind now in existence and available to increase the bank-note circulation several hundred millions; and most bonds issued hereafter would naturally be registered, and payable in gold.

(*b*) All such bonds must have been listed for at least five years prior to their deposit as security for circulation, upon at least one stock exchange located in some city in the United States having a population of 500,000 or more.

This would exclude all bonds except those having a well-established character, as well as recognized high value.

(*c*) No bond which has ever been in default for non-payment of interest, or which has sold on any stock exchange below par within five years, or which has sold on any stock exchange at less than a premium of five per cent above par within three years of its proposed deposit as security for circulation, shall be accepted under this law.

The result of this would probably be that the bonds deposited as security for circulation would have an average gold market value of at least 110, which would make them to-day a very much better security for bank-note circulation than United States bonds were from 1862 to 1865.

(*d*) No state bond representing a *per capita* debt of over two dollars for each of its citizens, no county bond representing a *per capita* debt of over four dollars, and no city bond representing a *per capita* debt of over eight dollars, shall be accepted as security for bank-notes.

The object of this is to discourage, rather than encourage, the increase of state, county, and city debts—a consummation devoutly to be wished.

(*e*) All railroad bonds deposited must be secured by mortgage, and none shall be of the form known as trust or debenture bonds.

(*f*) No bank shall have more than twenty per cent of its bonds on deposit of the issue of any one state, county, city, or railroad.

This provision is intended to protect the banks from loss, but is of course not needed for the security of the government or the noteholder.

(*g*) Whenever any bond upon deposit under this law shall sell, upon any stock exchange upon which it is listed, for a period of thirty days at an average price of less than 105, the comptroller of the currency shall require it to be replaced by a bond fully meeting the requirements of this law.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(*h*) Whenever any railroad which was paying dividends at the time its bonds were accepted as security for the circulating notes of any bank, ceases to pay regular dividends, the comptroller of the currency shall require said bank to substitute other bonds of the character called for by this law.

II. Any president, vice-president, manager, secretary, treasurer, auditor, or other officer of any interstate railroad (any of whose bonds are on deposit under this law) who shall knowingly issue or permit to be issued any false statement of the earnings, expenses, or condition of said railroad, shall be considered guilty of a felony, and be subject to trial in any court of the United States, and if found guilty shall be sentenced to imprisonment at hard labor for a term of not less than ten nor more than twenty years, and may be fined in addition, at the discretion of the court, in any sum not exceeding $100,000.

The advantages of this portion of the law, which it is a pity we are compelled to limit to interstate roads, will not be confined to the banking system, but will give a protection to the general public which has long been needed, and which will tend to give far greater stability to American railway investments.

III. In lieu of all other United States taxes, each bank shall pay in the usual manner a semi-annual tax of one per cent (two per cent per annum) upon the average amount of its notes in circulation.

This will produce a large revenue for the government, and will tend to prevent the creation of new forms of taxation, which will be required to meet its present extravagant expenditures. When money on call falls to one-half per cent or even to one and a half per cent per annum, this rate of taxation will cause Eastern banks to deposit lawful money at Washington for the redemption of their notes, and thus impart an element of elasticity to the general circulation. Experience may prove that this tax can be still further increased, adding to the income of the treasury, and giving still greater flexibility to the volume of paper money.

IV. The present United States tax upon the circulating notes of state banks shall cease, provided such notes are secured in precisely the same manner as national bank-notes, by bonds deposited with the auditor or treasurer of the State; and provided, also, that the State in which said bank is located shall guarantee the payment of its circulating notes. State banks shall pay the same taxes on their notes, and in the same manner, as national banks.

This would, in every State where there was a demand for it, restore state banking to its old condition of usefulness, and would silence the now well-founded charge that national banks enjoy an exclusive and therefore special privilege,—that of issuing circulating notes.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

V. The amount of the notes issued by any state bank shall be under the control of the State in which it is located, and nothing in this law shall restrict the circulating notes of any state bank to ninety per cent of the capital paid in; but no bank shall issue notes in excess of ninety per cent of the par value of the bonds deposited by it to secure the payment of said notes.

This provision will be recognized as sound by most competent bankers, and experience will probably lead to its extension ultimately to national banks. It gives the banks also the power promptly to increase the money in circulation when urgently needed, such extra supply being retired under the influence of the tax burden unless there should continue to be reasonable demand for it; thus having a tendency still further to develop flexibility in our financial system.

VI. State banks shall not be compelled to redeem their notes anywhere but at their own counters.

Should it be deemed desirable in any State to make the circulation of the notes issued by its banks local, and to throw about it influences which would tend to hold them within the bounds of the State, this part of the law would provide a way for doing so.

VII. All state bank-notes issued under this law to be, like national bank-notes, redeemable in United States legal tender, coin or notes.

MICHAEL D. HARTER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE "BENNETT LAW" IN WISCONSIN.

An Eastern gentleman of wealth and social position, in a casual conversation on a railroad journey some time since, asked me for an account of the late school controversy in Wisconsin. I inquired his understanding of it, whether he also supposed, as so many at the East still appeared to think, that the popular decision virtually allows the public schools to be taught in the German language in whatever districts this should be desired, and looks to a sharing of the school fund or its income with sectarian schools. He said that such was not far from the impression Eastern people had derived. He confessed also that he supposed that there were considerable areas of Wisconsin in which the English language is but little spoken, and communities where public affairs are transacted, and even the public records written, in a foreign language, commonly the German. And but recently a metropolitan journal has imputed to a gentleman selected as worthy to represent the United States upon a commission to the Old World, the flippant remark that Wisconsin is little better than a "European province." This journal concluded its comments on the outcome of the polls in Wisconsin with the intimation to its readers that it was almost more than could be hoped that the school fund should be left unharmed by the victors. Thus it would seem that the desperate campaign alarums of the defeated party, which were here put to scorn, have elsewhere been accepted by many as a confession of the truth of the controversy.

They who do not desire to cherish error may receive with interest a dispassionate statement of the facts, and give heed to the nature and importance of the principle involved. But this must go with the distinct avowal that it is not proffered to the approbation of all. The doctrine still obtains, among many who profess allegiance to Republican liberty, that those human beings who for the time happen to possess the power of government may justly apply it to their fellow human beings, to subjugate their opinions, habits, and manners to conformity with those of the rulers; and not a few of these sure possessors of wisdom and virtue still burn with that faithful ardor,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which, in their progenitors in the doctrinal line, so often led in days gone by to the stern gratifications of the thumb-screw, the wheel, the gibbet, and the stake. From these, the more clearly we define the principle of our controversy, the more surely we invite disapproval.

But there is another class with whom liberty and equal rights of all is no phrase of demagogy, but a living faith. These are demanded, because to be less than free is slavery, the portion only of the base and ignoble; and because, in the calmest reason, individual liberty is the mainspring of human development and the corner-stone of society's highest estate. To such it matters not whether the principles and practice of arbitrary interference with the opinions and privileges of individuals come from hereditary monarchs or elective majorities; whether in the arrogance of power, or disguised under sweet covering pretexts; whether by gross usurpation or insidious encroachment. Though the former may arouse a sharper resentment, the latter is known for the more dangerous aspect; but, in whatever form advanced, clear judgment demands instant resistance and repulsion. By men of this faith and temper, the Democrats of Wisconsin wish their contest of last year to be correctly understood, sure then that approving judgment by them from whom only they would seek it will not need to be courted by soft persuasion.

The purpose of this paper is not, therefore, to advance argument so much as to exhibit the nature of our controversy as it was made, to dispel any misconception of it by men of just principles. Another reason requires clear explication of this controversy. There is ground to believe, notwithstanding the stunning blow given in Wisconsin, that it is still to be maintained by the defeated party here and elsewhere. Some of their spokesmen have openly proclaimed their inveteracy of purpose, discounting the disaster sustained as a "Bull Run" misfortune, rather to be taken as the presage of ultimate success than as a final judgment to be accepted from the people; and, notably in Illinois, the disagreement between the Republican Senate and the Democratic House has remitted the question to the people of that State as a certain issue in the next election.

So industriously has misinformation been disseminated, that it will perhaps give surprise to some to tell that this agitation did not relate to the public schools, their support, government, or course of instruction, nor to the use or care of the school fund, nor to public education in any form. Assiduous effort, indeed, was put forth, after the campaign fashion, to represent one side as the peculiar friends, the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

other as the enemies, of the public schools; and there was much vociferation of the "The Little Red Schoolhouse," with comical pathos, during the earlier stages of discussion, but with effect only beyond the borders of the State, within which it soon appeared ludicrously irrelevant and far-fetched. The real controversy turned upon the right of the State to govern purely private schools, and to assume the education of children.

For ten years, since 1879, there had been upon the statute-book, with general acquiescence, a compulsory attendance law, which required, under penalty of fine, every parent, guardian, or other person in charge of any child between the ages of seven and fifteen years to send the child to some school, public or private, for at least twelve weeks in each year, unless excused by the school board upon one of several prescribed grounds. At the session of 1889 the "Bennett Law" (so named, not from its author, but from the member who introduced the bill) was enacted by the Legislature, having been promoted to passage in such a way, whether by skill or chance, that it escaped all attention, while depending in that body, from those most interested against it. This act superseded the law of 1879, with minor changes not relating to the principle now to be considered, but required the attendance of the child for a period not less than twelve nor more than twenty-four weeks in each year, to be fixed annually, in advance of September 1, by the school board in each district or city; that such attendance should be consecutive during such portion of the compulsory period as the board should determine; while excuse for non-attendance was required to be made out to the satisfaction of that board as the sole and final judge; and concluded these provisions with this significant section:—

> 'No school shall be regarded as a school under this act, unless there shall be taught therein, as part of the elementary education of children, reading, writing, arithmetic, and United States history in the English language."

It is obvious that this denunciation was aimed at the private schools. Although the language is general, the Legislature could not be supposed to have purposed to declare the public schools to be no schools, nor in such terms and manner to be providing amendment to the long-established, uniform course of study in them then required to be conducted in English. But whatever its effect on the public schools, which raised no question, the statute confessedly denounced as no school within its purview whatever private school should not

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

conform to these requirements; and upon the ideas so set in law, the controversy arose.

This legislation must have for its support two cognate principles of vital importance to men: first, the right of public authority to prescribe the course and subjects of instruction in schools maintained as purely private establishments, without public cost, by parents who seek to educate their children after the dictates of conscience; and, secondly, the right of the State to intervene between any parent and child, and, *in loco parentum*, to assume and control the education of all children.

It is not said that this legislation exerts the full power which these doctrines would give, or a near approach to it, but that it necessarily asserts them as fundamental to it, implies their rightful existence as principles of government, and, to the extent it goes, stands upon them. It is true that, although some plainly and bravely avowed these doctrines, the popular advocates of the law generally disputed that they were involved, and, by refinement upon the words of the statute, strove to give it an interpretation which would avoid the acknowledgment. They were, however, unable to withstand the force of some obviously controlling considerations. The law clearly gave power to the school boards to require twenty-four consecutive weeks' attendance in the year; and, if the Legislature might so authorize it for twenty-four, it might also for fifty-two. But twenty-four, perhaps even twelve, were enough, if the private schools must be so long deprived of pupils, to practically destroy them. And although the minimum period was but twelve weeks, and the minimum of consecutive attendance discretionary, as if to suggest the expectation of less than the full rigor in practice, yet the power was fully granted, and the fear of a purposed gradual encroachment to the limit was justified by the provision to enable it. Every private school must therefore, as a practical consequence, have conformed to the requirements of this law, or have closed: submission to the course of study prescribed was a condition of continued existence. If so much might be lawfully done to this end, so might whatsoever should be found further requisite, if this proved ineffectual.

The consequence, in principle, is inevitable. If public authority may prescribe some branches of study, so may it prescribe others, or forbid any. In short, by the same right, the private school may be required to conform its course of study to the public school, even religious training be proscribed. and the objects which parents seek in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the education of their children by private schools entirely defeated. Since, also, the inquiry may be committed thus to public authority, whether a private school shall be regarded as a legal school, it follows that visitation and inspection may be given to appropriate agents or officers. Thus, the logical possibilities of the power so asserted involve every essential of full control, perhaps of direct abolition, of the private schools; and only the caprice or discretion of authority marks the point of forbearance.

Nor is the right to substitute public for parental government less plainly implied by this legislation. That every parent may be compelled to send his children to a school in which the public authority fixes the subjects and mode of instruction for any length of time, leaves it to the State to fix the period, and exhaustively direct the system, of education, implies power to deny the parent any share in it, and in necessary consequence is but the Spartan doctrine of public right to assume the parent's place in moulding the character and destiny of the young. Thus the principle asserted is no less than one of its advocates has phrased it: "The State may even abolish the relations between parent and child."

Plainly this authority, which subjects every family alike to the right of public visitation, is quite another thing from that proper police power which is exerted in the public care of orphans, abandoned children, and the offspring of the criminal or depraved. Nor is it necessary to say to an intelligent person that the rightful power of the State, within limitations not here requiring mention, to suppress conspiracies, or any criminal propaganda of schemes against the peace and order of society, even if denominated "schools" by the offenders, is not to be confounded with, and gives no reason for, public interference with the methods of education by the private schools of good citizens. The demarcation between the principles of the criminal law and the principles of private right is too clear in reason and long accumulated usage to excuse a confusion of ideas from different sides of the boundary. The house of the citizen may, under proper warrant, be searched for the evidences of crime or in pursuit of a criminal, but in entire consistency with the law which fortifies it as his castle, in recognition of the inviolability of the private rights of home.

The fact that the particular studies named in this law were required to be taught in the English language, ingeniously specious as it was, in no manner affects the question of principle. The point is not whether the branch of study is more or less desirable for the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

young, which is a subordinate matter of detail, but whether, as matter of fundamental right, the Legislature may prescribe what shall or shall not be taught in private schools, or take the child from the parent, however intelligent or faithful, to teach what the Legislature shall think most beneficial to him, or desirable to the public that he should know. Something more is due to be said in another aspect respecting the requirement, in this law, of English instruction; but more is not necessary at this point to distinguish the principle from the specious pretext put forward by this association with a detail.

The foregoing seems enough, although the inquiring reader will readily add more, to make it clear that the two doctrines mentioned were directly asserted by this legislation, and constitute the important features of the controversy it generated. It should be further noted that practically the two are inseparably connected. If the State may absorb the private schools within its system, the available agencies by which parents can, except in few cases, practically furnish any other than the public course of education to their children, are so substantially withdrawn that their control over the subject may well be said to be overthrown. The rich might, indeed, as some still do, provide instruction by competent tutors within their own houses; and they who are indifferent or hostile to any other than purely secular instruction might find no cause for personal remonstrance. But vast numbers there are who have no riches, and are far from indifferent to the religious training of their offspring; to whom the truths of religion are vital, governing obligations, imposing duty to their children which they must discharge as they hope for eternal life. Were it not true that these are of the classes who constitute the very strength of our civilization, yet their rights of private judgment are, as well by our written constitutions as in the elements of our system of liberty, of the most sacred nature, and their invasion is to be resisted as the common charge of all friends to civil freedom. To take, or threaten to take, from them control of their private schools; to interfere at all with the course of instruction which they would have pursued in them, while at the same time they without reluctance meet their full share of taxation for public schools, and in every relation faithfully discharge the duties of useful citizenship,—must surely be admitted to deny them substantial rights, of a nature to make the deprivation peculiarly humiliating. The injury from their standpoint becomes greater by the fact that our State constitution rigorously and justly excludes all sectarian teaching from the public schools, so that even

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

reading the Bible is declared by the Supreme Court within the prohibition; and thus to the private school the constitution directly remits the only means of religious training outside the home and the church. The remark is parenthetically ventured, that, from this and other provisions, argument may well be drawn that the fundamental charter thus impliedly guards the private school from public interference, as surely as it guards the public school from the influence of private or sectarian opinion.

The avowed supporters of what are thus shown to be the underlying principles of this law take extreme ground. The importance of a correct training of the child to his future usefulness as a citizen, not only in what is taught, but what is withheld, to which all must agree; the evil of militant religious doctrines which have bloodied the pages of history; the superiority of the system adopted by common judgment for public instruction; the promotion of homogeneity and equality by like training from generation to generation; and above all the supreme right and duty of the State, for its safety and in discharge of its agency for humanity, to overrule private rights and interests to the common weal and glory—not as a reproach, but simply to state the fact—these, carried to this conclusion, are the arguments of socialism. It might be shortly replied that infallibility in the choice of methods is not conceded to majorities more than to autocrats. But the antagonism is radical, and stands upon the old and word-worn, yet ever new, cardinal principle of democratic liberty, which forbids the least subjugation of the individual below the line of what each must yield to the common freedom of all.

Here, then, was the stand of the Democratic party in Wisconsin. It maintained, accordingly, that whatever be the shortcomings of parental compared with ideal education, whatever the inferiority of private to public schools (granting these for argument's sake), such evils are as nothing to those which must follow the invasion of the rights of private judgment, parental control, and the family circle; while by the diffusion of enlightenment, never so rapid as among the free, the supposed disadvantages will as completely disappear as the infirmities of humanity will allow. Thus the balance of a cold calculation of relative merits. But other demerits must be reckoned in the forecast of results. For where will be found among free-born men the father, worthy of the gift of children, who will yield but to force the right to direct their nurture and education?

So far, however, from implying by this recognition of private

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rights any hostility to the public system of education, the party in Wisconsin sees in it both additional incentive for promoting the value of that system and a measure of protection and safety to it. Next to the preservation of his liberty and equal rights, the advancement of the individual in enlightenment and personal development is fundamentally essential to republican institutions. It is at once the condition of permanence and the highest resulting object of civil liberty. For this reason the State stands charged with no greater duty than to provide the means of education for all, free, abundant, and complete. Enfranchised from every entanglement with church or creed, seeking mental freedom as well as intellectual power, its system extends to secular instruction only, forbidding every intruding touch or hue of sectarian opinion. Its advantages of means and power to this end, if well used, no private agency can successfully compete with. They should be pressed to the utmost, until the public schools, in well-constructed gradation from the primaries to the university, afford, without price, to all the youth of the State the most helpful opportunities which the best-trained skill of man can provide for acquiring all knowledge contributory to every useful industry or calling. The theory sometimes heard, that the public effort should be limited to the district school and the simpler branches of common learning, deserves toleration only to be put down by reason. Slowly it must be, but surely in the order of time it shall come to pass, that every citizen will be afforded education to the measure of his capacity.

If, in such comparison of benefit and cost to pupils, private schools may still compete in secular as well as religious instruction, to what injury? Up to this day, private schools have rendered a useful service. They assist in relieving the public schools, generally overpressed by numbers, especially in cities, and they furnish a natural field for experiment and progress. Uniformity is prescribed to the public schools, and the genius of improvement works to best advantage in the free opportunity of the private schools, which have often led in invention of good methods. Notable examples may be mentioned, of schools of excellence and renown, dependent on the individuality of teachers who made them objects of love and labor. And among the institutions of a free people none would appear less justly exposed to attack than schools aiming to be useful, and dependent on their value for favor.

Instead of inflicting injury, the popular decision has doubtless averted serious harm with which the "Bennett Law" indirectly

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

menaced the public schools. Their prosperity must stand in the warm attachment which every intelligent citizen cannot but have for them, unless they are made the prop or pretext for injury to the interests or feelings of his class or race. Even belief, on the part of many, that such was the effect or purpose of that law, must have engendered reactionary results of harm, fortunately prevented by its summary and decisive suppression. History is too full of instances where civilized progress has been painfully retarded by forceful measures to promote it, to leave doubtful the estimate of results from attempting to drive by force, against or in advance of public opinion, even a scheme of excellence—which this was not.

Thus, apart from the particular circumstances, and so far as possible purely in the abstract, the subject has been stated. But, as usual in human affairs, there were upon this skeleton frame of dispute the flesh and nerves of actual realities of life, with the natural passions and pains of quarrel.

There have long been many private schools in Wisconsin, some under the care of religious denominations, others, though many less in number, professing no special religious training, but competing for pupils by the claim of excellence. Of the denominational schools, the Lutherans and the Catholics maintain more than all others. In some localities, many members of the Catholic congregations are of German birth or parentage, and the Lutherans are mostly of German or Norwegian extraction. It needs be said to no one acquainted with them, that these people are sincere and devout Christians, as well as among the best and most useful citizens. No cavil has ever been raised by them against the public schools, or any measure of taxation for their support; nor is there just reason to apprehend any. No claim has ever been advanced or need be feared that the public funds should contribute aid to their parochial schools. The constitution of the State, established when the Democratic party was in strong ascendency, contains ample safeguards against every such possibility. The amendment which "The National League for the Protection of American Institutions" desires embodied in the Federal Constitution would add nothing of substance to the provisions of the constitution of Wisconsin.

But the sincere faith of these good people obliges them to afford their children the lessons of divine truth, as it is given them to see it, and they maintain their schools, as their churches, for conscience' sake. It is manifestly essential to their objects that they remain

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

under their guidance. Any measure looking toward public control of private schools must give them peculiar concern, and there were evidences enough that this was aimed directly at them, and not without affronting aspects.

Prime in this double effect was the requirement for teaching in the English language, because it was felt to be a pretext, and an unjustifiable pretext, to cloak a covert and harmful design. There was no occasion for a sudden legislative spasm to extend a knowledge of the English tongue among the people of the State, and the imputation of ignorance so implied was naturally offensive. It is indeed difficult to contemplate with temperance the injuries to our good report abroad which the libels and half-truths put forward in advocacy of this law have done, nor will they be soon forgotten.

Thirty or forty years ago the plea of fact might have found more excuse, when our foreign population were new immigrants; but now half the number so classed are American born, and hold Wisconsin for fatherland. Of them few above infantile years are not conversant with English, and very many have not only lost the language of their parents, but all trace of foreign aspect or accent, so that names alone suggest their race origin. It could not be otherwise. These are not inferior people, but of the same Anglo-Saxon blood that we boast. None excel them in the successful pursuit of the various avocations of citizenship. No learned profession, no walk of business, but holds them among its foremost. How could they thus win place in the competitions of men if they unwisely deny themselves the common language of the country?

Were this the true objective of this law, it should have been addressed to adults of foreign birth. The children, in daily familiar contact with their neighbors, needed it not. They gather English almost as they breathe. The land of their fathers is a far-away story: here is the home of their senses. They speedily become interpreters in affairs for parents to whom acquisition of a new speech is naturally hard. Foreign-born parents find constant effort needful to preserve in children knowledge of their own tongues. It is one of the objects of their private schools. But, so far from the purpose to suppress English, a large majority of such schools impart instruction by apportioned hours in that, as well as in German; and the pupils of nearly all of those which teach in German only are sent for that reason to the public schools for part of the year. The policy of the Lutherans, often reiterated in their synods and assemblies, was clearly spoken in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

1871 by their eminent clerical leader, the Rev. C. F. W. Walther, in these words:—

> "The English language must not be neglected. We must endeavor to furnish our children the very best instruction therein. . . . The public schools are a political necessity, and of greater importance in a republic than in a monarchy. If we have at heart the prosperity of our adopted country, then our Christian duty bids us maintain the public schools."

What evil to our social order, to our prosperity as a people, can any attribute to want of knowledge of the English tongue among the foreign-born who for fifty years we have invited to the State? The past must show it, if any there be. Crime has not resulted, nor disregard of public duty, nor business dishonesty. Nor has there been lack of public spirit. Popular generosity has been signal to every form of educational and eleemosynary institutions. Comparison with any State may be challenged for manifestation of the qualities which mark the manly excellence of a good people.

The very terms of the English clause asserted the obnoxious principle of the law. Children were not required to be taught English, which mere provision for a public examination would have secured, but particular studies were to be pursued in that language. But if four, why not any number? In Illinois, a fifth was added. And why the "three R's" and history, more than others? To plant the germ of the district school? To any eye, this threw open the door of the private school to whatever shape of paternalism the Legislature might send to rule it.

Is it matter of wonder that the professed purpose of the "Bennett Law" was seen for a pretext and an affront?

It was not, therefore, the mere requirement of English teaching, nor even the fear of direct special harm from this law, so much as belief that it was the deliberate assertion of vicious doctrine with secret and hostile purpose,—because, in the apt phrase of the day, it was the "entering wedge,"—which stirred indignant opposition by men who resented the attack on the rights of good citizens.

Inquiry disclosed many confirmatory evidences of this purpose in the circumstances of the origination and promotion of this law. Similar acts were passed in Illinois and Wisconsin the same winter. The measure was novel and unexpected, but responded significantly to the inspiration of an Eastern propaganda of hostility to private schools and the Catholic Church, which freely returned its contributory aid of praise. Whether justly or unjustly to its promoters, the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

act evoked some favoring support from latent "American" ill-will to foreigners, with natural retort of feeling.

But, except as adjuncts of the controversy in fact, these are not important to the objects of this article. Whatever the secret aims of its projectors, the law asserted unmistakable doctrines; and the popular discussion of them by the press, on the stump, and in the conversational circle was at least unusually interesting, and with understandable exceptions generally deemed beneficial, because of that recurrence to first principles ever instructive in a republic. Rarely in political campaigning do the foundations of the public authority receive a more intelligent and honest scrutiny; and rarely is found a political verdict with so general public acceptance as right.

Three votes in the Legislature last winter gave signal refutation of the campaign slanders upon the victorious party. The repeal of the "Bennett Law" was passed by 21 to 11 in the Senate, and 83 to 14 in the Assembly; 21 out of 46 Republicans voting on the question recording themselves against the measure supported by their party in the campaign. The Democrats then brought forward a compulsory attendance law, framed without injustice; and but one Republican in the Assembly and none in the Senate were found to record a negative vote. Whatever calumny may have done abroad, no public judgment after contest was ever so unanimously recorded in Wisconsin. Equally significant was the third expression. For some years, besides an additional mill tax of near $600,000 a year, making $3,500,000 a year levied for public schools, our people have charged themselves with an annual eighth-mill tax, yielding nearly $75,000, to augment the income of the University. This year, by a vote of 119 to 1 in both Houses, the latter levy was doubled for six years to come, to provide a gymnasium for students, a law-school building, and a house for practical instruction in cheese-making. If any heart still palpitates with fear for the 6,500 district schoolhouses of Wisconsin, or for the safety of the school fund, these facts should give it peace.

WILLIAM F. VILAS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE SCHOOL CONTROVERSY IN ILLINOIS.

THE government of these United States, I conceive, is based, not on a system of paternalism, not upon the idea that government should do every thing for the individual, but rather upon an intention to further certain clearly conceived and narrowly bounded purposes believed to be the legitimate and peculiar province of government. Exactly what these ends are may indeed be a subject of discussion; but it is evident that the government is endowed not only with the means of self-perpetuation, but with the most efficient means not detrimental to other rights.

The government of the United States is one wherein all citizens who are believed to be of sufficient mental acuteness, and sufficiently well balanced, to be good advisers, are endowed with a share in the government. The immediate rulers are chosen by the votes of citizens; public measures are successful in gaining adoption or otherwise as the majority dictates; and public policies are the creatures of the individual opinion of the majority. As a consequence, public officials are good or bad, wise or stupid, upright or corrupt, as are the voters beneath them; measures adopted by the nation are just and reasonable, or unjust and foolish, as are the men who support them; and the public policy reflects the mental and moral characteristics of the average voter, as his vote represents him. In short, our government is what its citizens are, be they good or bad. Therefore if the standard of citizenship is raised, if the vast body of citizens is improved and made better for purposes of citizenship, the government itself is made better.

Clearly, then, it is competent and within its proper functions for the government to take such measures and to make such requirements as will tend to the training of efficient citizens. What determines that efficiency must be discovered from a consideration of the duties of the citizen.

The casting of a ballot is a bagatelle; for the considerations which determine the wording of a ballot or the names written thereupon are the important things. These considerations are of two sorts, moral and mental. The voter is a good one (1) as he desires to throw his influence for right and the public good, and (2) as he is able correctly

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to determine the effect of his ballot. The aims of government must be, then, the development of moral consciousness and mental clearness in the citizen; and the government not only may take such moderate and reasonable measures as may tend to these ends, but has the right to insist upon their application to all the citizens of the future. In short, the government has a right to compel, within reasonable and moderate limits, such education as may secure a better and more efficient citizenship.

Nor do I forget that the casting of a ballot, though the most efficient and direct means of affecting the welfare of government, is but one of many means; for the same qualities in the individual make for evil to government, whether he be a voter or not. He is a good citizen who is, either at the polls or on the street, of upright conscience and a clear understanding; and the government must adopt toward the non-voting citizen a like course to that which it adopts toward the voter.

The question whether there can be direct and deliberate training in the direction of morality merely, remains, indeed, an open one, and is for the consideration of the schoolmaster. But the State, as it is at present constituted, evidently is concerned with the two forms of education above outlined; it has a right to enforce these, and these only, and is concerned with no other form of education. The religious education of the citizen, for instance, however desirable it may be, and however valuable, is not a fit subject of consideration for our government, not alone because it is utterly impracticable for a nation religiously conglomerate, but because our Constitution, in full agreement with the spirit of our institutions, positively forbids any union of Church and State.

To sum up, the government has a right to provide education for the intellectual and the moral training of its future citizens, and to compel their attendance upon it; but it has no right to provide any other education, much less to compel their acceptance of it. Nor is there need of argument to show the expediency of such compulsory education. A rising generation left to grow up in ignorance must in time become a ruling generation, caring little for good government, but, on the contrary, prone to those practices which make government weak and corrupt.

Now for the application of these general principles to the facts of present political conditions, recently much discussed. Public appre-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ciation of the danger to the State of youth growing up in ignorance has brought about compulsory education laws, so moderately drawn that the framers, it seems to be generally conceded, had not the faintest conception of any possible organized opposition among respectable people. But there has been much opposition, appealing, with more or less honesty, to religious prejudice; and two sects, the Roman Catholic and the Lutheran, have apparently succeeded in holding the balance of power, and in electing, in Illinois and Wisconsin, State officials pledged against the laws upon the statute-books. In estimating the significance of this result, the public mind has wholly ignored three most important considerations: first, that the political party which in a half-hearted fashion defended the law was for other reasons, whose effect can in no manner be exactly estimated, fore-ordained to defeat; second, that the voters whose votes were changed because of the school question, the tariff, and all other reasons combined, were but a small portion of the total number voting; and, third, that people in general refused to consider seriously the probability of a Democratic anti-school-law victory, either in Wisconsin or in Illinois, thus losing to the Republicans such voters as might have joined them from belief in the compulsory education laws. The "judgment by default" taken in these two States cannot reasonably be interpreted as any expression of opinion upon a fairly drawn issue, or as any permanent settlement of the question.

Whether these laws were defective in detail, and gave to petty officials the power of injustice and oppression, I do not know, nor is it material to the question of principle. The campaign of opposition has been waged on the law itself, not upon any detail. True, there has been much complaint about individual features of the law, but it has been vague, and unaccompanied by any suggestions of satisfactory amendment, short of abolishment; and during the campaign, abolishment, not modification, was demanded. If amendments are needed, let them be made.

The grounds of opposition to the compulsory education law are two in number: first, and in public discussion decidedly foremost, the assertion that the public school, being non-religious, cannot properly educate the children of the Church, and that the law designs to undermine the private school; and, second, the appeal to the love of the mother-tongue, usually German, which, it is asserted, is likely to be driven out by English. The latter argument, used to inflame the prejudices of the ignorant, appears less frequently in public discussion.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The law * makes two requirements pertinent to the present discussion,—that every child within a certain age shall attend school twelve weeks in each year, and that instruction in certain elementary branches shall be given in the English language. I submit that neither of these requirements in the slightest degree justifies the opposition, but that, on the contrary, each requirement is far less than the State might justly demand.

For be it remembered, if the parochial school fulfils the statute requirement, its work is accepted upon the same terms as that of the public school. The law requires that the parochial school shall, for twelve weeks each year, teach children certain elementary branches in the English language—only this, and nothing more. In other words, the law affects those parochial schools, and those only, which refuse to teach their children for a part of the day in English, for twelve weeks only in the year. Should a school which either refuses twelve weeks' teaching per year, or refuses to give its pupils even this slender opportunity of acquiring the English tongue, be accepted as sole nurse of American children? Not if the State has a right to protect itself, as we have heretofore concluded, against incapable citizens. Perhaps the most influential newspaper in the North-west to-day, the one which has been the chief power in this fight against public schools, is one which circulates among a population one-third of whom cannot read the ballots they vote, because they are printed in English; who cannot testify in the courts without an interpreter; who cannot act as jurymen, through inability to understand the language used; and who are absolutely insulated from the influence of American institutions. There are native-born American citizens of the third generation to whom English is an absolutely unknown tongue.

Evidently he who is dependent upon another to read his ballot to him is not a safe citizen or voter; and evidently the State could not require less if it in any way endeavored to secure to its citizens knowledge of the public tongue. Therefore these States of Wisconsin and Illinois have shown moderation in their exercise of an undoubted right and duty, which grows more astonishing as it is more fully comprehended. For there is not, as charged, any crusade against German. Certainly the class to whom the present writer belongs would be the last to abolish among German-speaking people the use of their language. Rather would we have it more generally known. That the fathers should read Lessing, Schiller, Goethe, and Heine in the origi-

* Wisconsin Session Laws, 1889, chap. 519; Illinois Laws, 1883, p. 167.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nal, and their children be shut out from such enjoyment, would be a calamity; and I as deeply deplore it as any one could. I ask, not that German literature should be unknown to the "German-American," but that he may be also familiar with the masterpieces of the English tongue. I know, indeed, that there is much honest opposition to these laws; but I protest against that short-sightedness which would make the immigrant, welcomed to this freer land, a stranger in a strange land, alien in speech, in customs, in institutions. I ask, not that English may drive out German, but that the language which accident has made prevalent and official should have, not all the time, not even one-half the time, but part of the day for twelve weeks in a year of the school-hours and school-years of a child's life.

The assertion, also, that the law makes war upon the parochial schools is far from the truth. In very many localities the German parochial schools have been kept up for part of the year only, with the purpose, deliberately adopted and expressed by the church authorities, that their children might attend the public schools during the remainder of the year, and learn English. Under such a system there is absolutely no conflict between the law and the parochial schools. But, if this be not desirable, the interference with the curriculum of the parochial school is slight, consisting solely of the requirement of the use of English during only a very small part of the time. The time remaining is ample for any desired instruction in religion or in morals.

I sum up, then, as follows:—

I. The State justly claims the right to insist that those who are to grow up into her citizens shall learn to understand and freely use the language of the land.

II. To this end it may justly claim such small portion of the time of the pupil as may enable him to acquire that knowledge.

III. The amount of time actually claimed by the laws now in force is very slight, rather less, in fact, than is needed to effect the end proposed.

IV. The claim that there is any interference with the religious instruction in parochial schools is absolutely untrue; for no man proposes to use in religious instruction five-sixths of the hours of the school year; and the compulsory education laws of the two States referred to have absolutely no effect or bearing on at least five-sixths of the time.

V. Equally untrue is the supposition that the learning of German

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

or any other language is interfered with; since ample time remains for such purposes, untouched by any statute requirement.

VI. If the State cannot do what these laws require, it can do nothing toward compulsory education, nothing to protect itself against voters ignorant of the official language.

The essay in the FORUM for March, upon this subject, by President Bascom, which embodies the usual objections, is in many respects astonishing. Its author has a most honorable record for independence, for a refusal to surrender to a vicious and popular measure. Yet his argument, succinctly stated, is this: certain bodies of people dislike our public-school system; let us therefore placate them by making schools controlled by them, and not controlled by the State, a part of that system. Let us use moneys contributed by all classes of men to further the operations of religious bodies. I state this, not by any means as explaining Dr. Bascom's views, which must be read as he has expressed them in order to be clearly understood. But I submit that there are three fallacies in his article:—

First, He does not perceive that the requirements now made are the minimum possible, that if they are not retained there can be no compulsory education whatever. And Dr. Bascom has himself most truly turned the flank of his own position in this declaration: "Carefully guarded and moderate coercion, therefore, has come to be, considering the increase of alien and irresponsible citizens, a natural, if not a necessary, step in completion of our educational system." This is, though Dr. Bascom strangely fails to see it, the "last ditch" of compulsory education. In Heaven's name, what less could be asked?

Second, The real battle is not against compulsory education, but against public schools. In this same essay he mentions, as the first symptom of discontent, the parochial schools of the Lutheran and Roman Catholic churches, and seems to think that such discontent is the result of laws peculiar to Wisconsin and Illinois. In fact, those parochial schools antedated the compulsory education laws, and are conspicuous and powerful in other States. True, there are friends of public schools in those churches; but the opponents of compulsory education are opponents likewise of public schools, whether they are so opposed for religious reasons or through desire to make German, and not English, the language of the State. Be it remembered that German Lutherans boycott as vigorously the English Lutheran churches, which differ in nothing save the use of English in their services, as they do the laws under discussion.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Third, It is objected that taxation of supporters of the parochial schools for support of public schools also is unjust. It is easy, and, I take it, conclusive, to say that the public schools are designed to secure public safety by educating those who might otherwise become dangerous to society, exactly as courts and penitentiaries have similar purpose, and that taxation for the one purpose rests on exactly the same ground as the other. In neither case need taxation be confined to those who need the service of the institution for themselves or their children. Dr. Bascom's substitute, on the other hand,—namely, the subsidizing of parochial schools with public funds, if such be his darkly expressed plan,—is objectionable not only because it is tantamount to the union of Church and State, forbidden alike by our Constitution and the spirit of our institutions, but also because it does what Dr. Bascom himself charges against the present system,—it involves a double taxation; a taxation, too, for the support of systems believed to be essentially vicious. A system which obliges a Methodist or a Baptist, honestly fearing, distrusting, and disliking Catholicism, to contribute toward a fund from which Catholic schools draw their support, or which forces a Catholic, a Jew, or an Agnostic to aid in the support of a Methodist institution, involves a tyranny fortunately impossible to this nation.

Finally, this is not a question of compromise, but of defence. There is no tyranny in compelling the education of coming citizens, or in requiring financial aid from all taxpayers; and the public school, as the State conceives it, is organized to do a different work from that of the parochial school, has no competition with it, and no opposition to it. If the parochial school will do the essential work of the public school, the latter claims no further hold upon its pupils; and when its own work is done by itself or any other agency, that public school has no objection to any further education which parents or pupils may desire, whether religious, moral, or whatever its nature be. Nor do the requirements of the public school, as expressed in the compulsory education laws, in the slightest degree impede that further education in religion or in morals.

E. M. WINSTON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

REAL MEANING OF THE FREE COINAGE AGITATION.

THIS question cannot be answered and no definite conclusion can be reached upon the policy of free or limited coinage, either of silver or of gold, without treating separately the two functions which national governments have assumed in the matter of controlling or directing the supply of coins which may be required to serve the purpose of instruments of exchange. There has been much confusion in dealing with this question, because of the various definitions of the word "money;" but all writers concur in one respect: coined money is an instrument by which the exchange of services or of products is facilitated. Without spending time upon an abstract definition of the word "money," it will be admitted by all that one kind of money may be good money, and another kind of money may be bad money.

Perhaps the best definition of good money is that given by Henri Cernuschi, the most distinguished among the advocates of a monetary policy which has become known as "bimetallism." I quote from memory: "That coin only is good money of which the bullion is worth as much after it is melted as it is in the form of coin."

In order to discriminate between bad money and good money, it is necessary to separate in distinct terms the function of the government in regard to coinage, and the function of the government in making provision as to what kind of money shall be a legal tender for the payment of debts. When a government attempts to make bad money a legal tender, it perpetrates the worst fraud that can be inflicted upon a trusting people. It matters not whether the money consists of discredited paper or of discredited coin. In either case it is beyond the power of a government to maintain any kind of bad money in circulation to which the people refuse to give credit, whether paper or coin. If the quality of the coined money be kept at the highest standard, its credit will be established. If the quality of the money is not maintained, the credit of the money itself cannot be main-

A paper presented at the meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science held in Washington, August, 1891. Section I., Political Economy and Statistics.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tained, no matter how many acts of legal tender or attempts to force its circulation may be made. It lies with the community which makes use of the money, and not with Congress, to determine whether money is good or bad.

In order to find out what kind of money is worthy of credit, and what is not, the function of the government in respect to coinage must be dealt with separately from the enactment of statutes of legal tender.

What is coinage? There can be but one reply to this question. Coinage is merely a process of manufacturing round pieces of metal of given sizes, of definite weights, and of a certain fineness. What is meant by the word "fine" in connection with coinage? The law of the United States declares that the lawful unit of value is a gold coin which is named a dollar. It weighs twenty-five and eight-tenths grains, and it must be nine-tenths fine; that is to say, it must contain nine parts of pure gold and one part of the alloy which is added to harden the coin and to make it fit for its use. An act of the United States also directs the mints of the United States to coin a piece of silver, which is also named a dollar. The terms of this act are that the silver dollar shall weigh four hundred and twelve and one-half grains nine-tenths fine: the meaning of this act is that the silver dollar shall contain nine parts of silver and one part of the alloy which is added to harden the metal and to make it fit for its use.

Very little attention is given to these elementary propositions in the present discussion of the money question, yet it is necessary to deal with them in order that the money question may be considered on the basis of fact. Coinage consists, first, in putting together the grains of gold or the grains of silver and the grains of alloy, moulding them into the form of round disks of metal, which are named dollars, and, last, in stamping upon them certain designs by which whoever may take them or pay them out as money may be certain that they are true in weight and in fineness. The coinage of silver or gold is therefore a simple process of manufacturing these round disks of either metal, and of stamping them. That is the end of it. Nothing can be added and nothing can be taken away from this definition of coinage.

Why did governments assume the duty of manufacturing coins? and why do they forbid private persons or corporations from manufacturing them? It was simply in order to prevent those who make use of coin in buying and selling, or who make contracts which are to be liquidated in money, from being cheated or defrauded in the weight and the fineness of the coin. The governments of civilized countries

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

assumed the manufacture of coin simply for the purpose of maintaining the credit of the coin according to its name and kind in order to give confidence to the people of every state and nation that each coin is what it purports to be; or, in other words, that each coin contains the just and equal weight of gold or silver which it purports to contain in its own substance. When these coins become worn, and are thus reduced in their weight, they cease to be lawful money under existing statutes.

The essence of a coinage act is to justify the weight of metal in each and every coin. The usefulness of every coin rests upon the confidence which may be reposed in the government by which it is manufactured. The credit of the government and the credit of the coin are bound together: one cannot be impaired without the other. When a government issues a base coin, it ceases to be entitled to credit or to confidence. Nearly all coins can be traced by their very names to their origin, and may be proved to have been originally exactly what their names indicated; to wit, a certain weight of metal. The shekel of the Hebrew, the talent of the Greek, the pound of the English, the livre of the French, the tael of the Chinese, and many other names, prove by the very existence of the names themselves that the coins corresponding to them once stood for a certain and full weight of one of the so-called "precious metals."

It is very evident that so long as each coin remained true to its weight and true to its name, and thus retained the confidence of the people among whom it circulated, no act of legal tender could have been required to keep it in circulation. Any one holding an obligation of another to pay to him so many grains of silver or of gold requires no act of legal tender to compel him to receive payment in the just weight of metal which he has a right to expect.

How, then, did the conception of an act of legal tender originate? There are plenty of other ways and other forms of perpetuating the evidence that a man stands ready or has tried to fulfil his contract according to its terms as he understands them. No act of legal tender was or is required to enforce the acceptance of money of just weight, provided there are no other elements of dispute in regard to the contract. Any other elements of dispute in regard to a contract can be determined without any act of force or of legal tender affecting or prescribing the kind of money to be offered or received. Tenders of goods are often made and refused because the quality of the goods is bad: if that is proved, the buyer need not accept them, and the law

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

does not force him to do so. When, then, should the law force a man to receive bad money on a contract to pay in good money ?

As yet, although the writer has put the question to many men learned in the law, he has been unable to get a reply to the question, "In what country, at what time, and under what circumstances did the first conception of legal tender arise ?" May it not be held that no such conception could have entered the minds of men controlling the government of a country, except in contemplation of a fraud upon their own people ? May it not prove that whenever the first act of legal tender is traced to its origin it will be found to have been the act of a despotic ruler who at first debased the coin of the realm by taking from it a part of its weight, and then attempted to force the circulation of the base coin by forbidding any citizen to refuse to accept it when offered in payment of a debt or in liquidation of a contract ? Must not the very conception of a forced circulation of any kind of money under an act of legal tender have been born in fraud and nursed in corruption ? In this view, does not the attempt to force silver dollars in circulation by an act of legal tender, when they are worth less than a dollar of gold, become a fraud, unless silver dollars were named in the contract or are redeemed in gold ?

One may well reason by analogy in dealing with this question. If the government did not undertake to force the circulation of a silver dollar by an act of legal tender, and did not also under an act of legal tender give an option to the debtor of which the creditor is deprived, there could be no more objection to the free coinage of two kinds of dollars by the mints of the United States—one made of gold and one made of silver—than there is to the sealing or certification of two kinds of pounds weight.

The common unit of weight is the grain. The grain is the unit by which gold and silver are measured. The relative value of each kind of coin may be fixed by the number of grains of pure metal in each. We have two different lawful pounds,—one pound called the avoirdupois, the other called the troy,—there is but one grain. The grain is the same: the pounds vary in weight. The troy pound contains only 5,760 grains. The avoirdupois pound contains 7,000 grains. The government has not thought it necessary to just dealing that it should actually manufacture the weights which are used on weighing-scales; but every government has found it necessary to establish the standard of each pound, and to require weights and measures to be sealed or certified by the proper authorities before

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

they are used for weighing or measuring. It is in order to prevent fraud that governments have assumed the function of sealers of weights and measures, precisely as the government has assumed the duty of manufacturing coin in order that weight, measure, and coin alike may each and all be true and just.

There is no act compelling the buyer and seller to deal only in avoirdupois pounds when buying or selling corn, or cotton, or meat, or iron. The troy pound is lawful. Any one who chooses to take a special contract naming pounds troy may deliver or receive 5,760 grains of wheat, or corn, or cotton for each pound; but the troy pound must be named in the contract, lest some one should prove to be a knave, and should attempt to deliver 5,760 grains in place of 7,000 grains, pleading that the weight of 5,760 grains is a pound. If the legal-tender act were amended so as to make it necessary for every one who wished to make contracts payable in silver dollars *to name silver in the contract*, then free coinage would be safe and suitable, so that all who prefer to deal on a silver basis might have all the coin they needed and could pay for. All outstanding contracts for the future delivery by weight, of corn, of wheat, of cotton, or of any other useful substance (except gold and silver, which are dealt with in weight of grains) are contracts for the delivery of pounds of 7,000 grains each. If the government were to pass a legal-tender act by force of which each person who had contracted to receive goods at the rate of 7,000 grains per pound should be compelled to receive for the same delivery in pounds of 5,760 grains, that government would fall in the face of the indignation of the people. Such an attempt at fraud could never be enforced, and such an act would be declared void by every court of highest jurisdiction in every State and by the Supreme Court of the United States.

There is a complete correspondence between this assumed case of what might be a legal but not a lawful fraud and the act by which it is attempted or proposed to compel all the holders of obligations which have been entered into on a gold basis, since the 1st of January, 1879, to accept silver dollars, which may not be worth as much as the gold dollar unless the government should continue to be compelled by statute to keep these dollars at par in gold by their redemption, or conversion into gold on demand. The silver dollar is discredited in the markets of the world, and the government of the United States is powerless to remove that discredit. It can only by act of legislation defraud its own people in pursuance of the pending effort to secure the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

free and unlimited coinage of silver dollars without any amendment in the present acts of legal tender.

On the other hand, if a free-coinage act were accompanied by a very simple change in the existing acts of legal tender, the free coinage of silver dollars as well as gold dollars might be permitted, and the mints might be declared open to receive bullion to be coined into dollars of gold or silver for any one who should bring either kind of bullion to such mints to be manufactured.

There would be no danger of an excessive coinage either of dollars made of gold or dollars made of silver, if personal liberty and the power of free contract are not interfered with by an act of legal tender. All that is necessary to the free conduct of business of every kind is that in respect to coinage the government shall limit its function to the manufacture of coins of the kind provided for in the statutes; and that it shall be held to be as dishonest and unfit, as it ought to be unlawful, to impair the terms of any contract by compelling a creditor, or a contractor, or a laborer, or a wage-earner, to receive dollars of a different and poorer kind than those in which he had a right to expect to be paid when entering upon the contract.

When the government limits itself to the manufacture of coin, without attempting to force the circulation of a discredited dollar, the people of the state, the city, and the town, will furnish themselves with as much good coin as may be required in each community to do the business therein offering. Each community will then devise its own method for economizing the use of coin by substituting the credit of banks and bankers on a true standard of what is just, right, and safe. The community that is in poor credit, and whose members distrust and reject banking methods on a sound basis, will have but little money in circulation, and will restrict its own business. The community which is in good credit—which elects to pay its debts according to its engagements and which furnishes itself by the act of its own members with banks, bankers, and other institutions of like kind—will always secure to its own use all the coin of the best kind that is necessary in its own commerce. It is as great a folly to assume that a well-established and prosperous community in which character and capacity are developed so that both the community itself, whether it be state, county, city, or town, and the members thereof, are fit to be trusted, cannot supply itself with as much coin of the highest standard as it requires, as it would be to assume that it could not supply itself with all the pounds and scales necessary to weigh its products; both coin

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and weight and scale being justified according to law, so that each may be as honest and true as the community is in which coin, scale, and weight are to be used.

This leads to the second consideration,—acts of legal tender. On what ground is it necessary that an act of legal tender should provide that the debtor shall have liberty to choose what kind of money he will offer, while the creditor is deprived of the choice as to what he will receive? The purpose of an act of legal tender may rightly be to perpetuate evidence that one party in a contract has endeavored to fulfil it by offer of payment according to his understanding of such contract, but it may not rightly be to impair the terms of the contract. The effort has been made time and time again in almost every country,—in almost every colony among those now constituting the United States,—by the United States and by the late Confederacy, to maintain two kinds of money made of different materials and of different value at the same ratio by acts of legal tender. No act of legal tender can do this. Such acts have failed in France, in the Latin Union, and in all other countries and places where the attempt has been made. It has been recently proved by Horace White in an article published in the "Political Science Quarterly" (June, 1891), as it had been previously proved by Prof. J. L. Laughlin in his "History of Bimetallism," that the attempt to maintain gold and silver coin at par with each other, and to keep them both in circulation at the same time, had wholly failed in France and in the Latin Union. Whenever a variation in the value occurred, even of one and a half per cent, one or the other coin left the country.

No act of legal tender of any kind is absolutely necessary in the conduct of commerce. Witness the fact that the international commerce of the world is not subject to any act of legal tender. Such acts are limited to the jurisdiction of the country by which they are passed, and they can have no application in any other country. What the entire measure of international commerce is, no one can tell. It is at least probable that the total volume of the international commerce of the world, to which no act of legal tender is or can be applied, is equal to the entire commerce among all the States and all the people of this country. International commerce has adjusted itself to the gold standard by the measure of the pound sterling, there being no legal coin of that name. The pound sterling is merely a designation now given to a certain number of grains of gold. International commerce, like all other commerce, consists in the exchange of products,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of which the accounts are carried on the books of merchants. The balances only are settled in money, and, in the settlement of such balances, trade-customs which are more powerful than law, have established a mode of settlement by bills of exchange drawn almost wholly in pounds sterling, London being the clearing-house, partly because it is a great commercial centre, but mainly because it is the centre of banking, to which all accounts may be brought for adjustment in terms of gold by the weight of metal designated "pound sterling."

If, then, this great volume of international commerce is more surely and more safely conducted, with less loss in settlements, and subject to less heavy charges, than any other branch of commerce or of banking, at the standard of gold by weight, it follows that if there were no act of legal tender (as there is none in China at the present time), commerce would go on in this and every other country, interstate and individual contracts would be made, and settlements would be had as effectively and in as great a volume as they are now.

This condition of security and stability can, however, be readily brought into effect by a mere change in terms, without the repeal of acts of legal tender in this country. That change would bring the act of legal tender into an exact position corresponding to the acts affecting the purchase and sale of goods by weight. There are, as I have stated, two lawful pounds weight, varying each from the other in the quantity of material that each represents or that is to be measured by the use of either. There is one standard weight named "grain." It is lawful for any person to make a contract in grains, either for the purchase or sale of any product of the mine, the field, the forest, or the factory. The products of the silver and gold mines are in fact all dealt in substantially in grains, or ounces containing a given number of grains. All other products are dealt in substantially in pounds avoirdupois, containing 7,000 grains.

It is also to be remarked that a simple change in the act of legal tender would bring the rule and practice of legal tender into a condition corresponding to the rule affecting the rate of interest. In every State there exists what is termed a "lawful rate of interest;" that is to say, a certain rate which will be sustained by the courts when no specific per cent is named in the contract. A corresponding rule could be established in respect to acts of legal tender, accompanied by a statute defining the kinds of money which should be receivable for duties and taxes by the United States Government.

It will be remembered, that, so long as the United States notes

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

commonly called "greenbacks" were depreciated, the government collected duties upon foreign imports only in gold coin. Presently, on the 1st of January, 1879, the United States Government, being enabled to resume the redemption of its bonds, its legal-tender notes, and its other obligations in gold coin, did so begin to redeem them; standing first in point of time among the nations that, having issued legal-tender paper money for the purpose of collecting a forced loan in the conduct of a great war, thereafter redeemed the promise carried by the note, and stood ready to pay the note, or to redeem it in coins named dollars of the best kind, made of gold. Since then the effort of the government has been mainly how not to pay its debts with such rapidity as to embarrass the community, and it has become very plain, that without effort, and probably in spite of efforts to reduce the revenue to the measure of necessary expenditure, the entire debt of the United States will be paid or redeemed in coin even before it matures. In accordance with this precedent and in order to avoid any unnecessary contraction of the circulating medium, which might do temporary injury even through the working of the mere imaginations of men, an act might be passed, coincident with an act for the free coinage of silver, to this effect: "Subsequent to the date of this act, the United States will receive payment of all duties, or taxes, or obligations owing to it, in coin made of gold, or in dollars made of silver which had been coined prior to the date of this act." This provision would undoubtedly keep the limited number of dollars made of silver which had been coined up to that date at par in gold, because their receipt for duties and taxes would be practically a redemption by the government in gold coin. The redemption of the legal-tender notes has maintained those notes at par or equal to gold, in the estimation of the community, since January 1, 1879. The same method of redemption of the silver dollars thus far coined in limited amount and quantity has maintained the silver dollars thus far issued at par in gold; our currency or money has all been kept at par with gold because all kinds can be converted practically into the gold dollars, which constitute the standard and the lawful unit of value of the country.

Provision being then made that silver dollars coined subsequently to the date of such act, although freely coined in exchange for silver bullion, would not be received by the government, but could only be used in contracts named in silver, all danger of depreciation of such silver dollars as are now outstanding might be done away with. Under these conditions, an act enabling any member of the community

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to bring gold or silver bullion to be manufactured into gold or silver coin at the mints of the government would be wholly safe. The single and simple change which would be required in the existing acts of legal tender, in order to make free coinage absolutely safe, and free from objection, would be an act corresponding to the acts relating to pounds weight and to the rate of interest; to wit, that contracts which did not specify dollars of silver should be liquidated only in dollars made of gold. Dollar would then mean what pound sterling now means,—so many grains of gold.

If any man to-day contracts to deliver a certain number of pounds weight of corn or cotton, he is held bound to deliver pounds of 7,000 grains each, and he can tender no other kind and no less number of grains under the guise of delivering pounds, although there is a lawful pound of 5,760 grains. If a man has contracted to pay a certain rate of interest on borrowed money without naming the rate, he is held to the payment of what is known as the lawful rate of interest in the State in which the contract can be enforced. Correspondingly, if, after the slight change in the legal-tender act proposed, any man should contract to meet his obligations in dollars, *not naming silver*, he would be held in every court to the payment of dollars made of gold, or their equivalent, and would be forbidden to attempt to commit a fraud upon his creditor by imposing upon him a silver dollar, if that dollar had become of less value than the gold dollar, or if the creditor did not wish to be paid in that kind of dollar.

Liberty of contract and freedom of coinage must go together in order that justice may be done, and that each member of the community may deal with his time, his work, or his goods on the safest and surest conditions, and also in order that the less intelligent or less well-informed members of the community may not be cheated and defrauded in being forced by an act of legal tender to take a kind of money which does not contain its own value within its own substance, or which may be worth less than it purports to be worth in bullion after the coin is melted.

It is not to be assumed that this proposition will take a practical form. The coinage of silver will be settled in a simpler way. As soon as the danger becomes manifest to the community that this country is likely to be forced upon the single silver standard under the present act of legal tender, by the continued coinage of silver dollars under the existing act of coinage, the simple and direct method of avoiding this disaster will come instantly by stopping the coinage

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of such dollars. It is within the lawful power of the Secretary of the Treasury to do so, and he will be sustained in stopping the coinage by the indignant protest of the whole business community of the country against proceeding any further on this dangerous road.

The purpose of this treatise is to present this case in such a way that it may become apparent to any person of common intelligence that mere free coinage is not the true object of those who advocate the unlimited coinage of silver dollars at the present time without any change in the present acts of legal tender. There are two classes or parties now engaged in this effort.

First, the owners of silver-mines and their advocates, both in Congress and without, who desire to sell silver bullion to the government at twenty to thirty per cent more than it is worth, taxing the people of this country for their own profit without any regard for any other interest than their own.

Second, the misguided persons who think it may be more profitable, especially to the farming community, to deprive them of any further credit by enabling them to pay their present debts in cheap money, or, in other words, in depreciated coin. With these misguided persons may be counted the politicians who mislead them in order to secure votes by advocating measures which they know to be wrong.

The consistent advocates of a treaty for international bimetallism to be made coincidently with a treaty for an international legal tender do not sustain the free coinage of silver dollars under the present conditions. They are as urgently opposed to it as those who think the single standard on a gold basis must be maintained in any event through the working of the higher laws of commerce.

The apparent strength of this effort to carry the free coinage of silver dollars of the present standard without any change in existing acts of legal tender lies in the widespread agitation which has given politicians who have no firm convictions of their own a false impression that there is a considerable force behind it. A little investigation proves that this appearance of strength is a sham. The advocacy comes from a few persons whose notoriety has been attained in this movement, but who are men of no intellectual force and of no influence in other matters. Let it be remarked that the senators from the so-called "silver States" and the most persistent and prominent advocates of free silver coinage in the House of Representatives, especially on the coinage committee, are men who have made no mark in any other way, who apparently have no other interest than this, and who

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are chiefly members of the Republican party. It is very strange indeed that so many members of the Democratic party should have followed this Republican lead.

Outside of the Senate and House of Representatives, the movement is evidently sustained with all the money that can be required to flood the country with publications. Promoters of the sale of silver are thus enabled to make a great deal of noise, but it is only noise.

As these facts become apparent, and as the men who are entitled to lead on either side by intellectual superiority become better and better informed upon the fraudulent character of this measure, it will die its natural death.

If these hopeful anticipations should not be realized, and there should not be sufficient courage and conviction in the Administration, at any given time when the danger becomes apparent, to prevent the country being precipitated upon the single silver standard of depreciated silver coin, a partial remedy lies within the power of each and every State. The Constitution of the United States provides that no State shall make any thing but gold or silver coin a legal tender for the payment of debts. The words of the Constitution are "gold *and* silver," thus leaving to each State the option of one or both as its standard. It follows of necessity that the States have reserved to themselves the power of deciding what shall be a legal tender in the contracts made among their own people. It will therefore rest with each State to decide this matter in respect to its own citizens, without regard to the action of the United States governing contracts entered into between the citizens of different States, which may be brought into the United States courts.

Each State may enjoy the benefit of a just and single standard on the gold basis. All contracts with the people of other States may be made specifically in terms of gold, while all contracts in the State among its own people will remain on that basis, under their own statutes of legal tender.

As a matter of course, capital will flow from the discredited States that may subject themselves to the disabilities of unlimited silver, to the States that retain a safe and stable standard on a gold basis. Business of all kinds may be for a time slightly limited, because the credit of all States that do not protect their contracts will be destroyed. This condition of things could not of course last very long, because it would be ruinous to the discredited States and to the people inhabiting them. A speedy return to a safe monetary system would ensue,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and the next Congress would be compelled to adjust the national acts of legal tender to safe conditions.

This alternative has been referred to at other times and in other places. The objection has been made to it, that such an intimation of State protection is in the nature of a threat. A threat to whom? Surely not to the people or to the State whose credit will be kept unimpaired by refusing to be subjected to the variations and fluctuations of a depreciated standard of value. If it is a threat at all, it is a wholesome threat to those who are trying to impose a fluctuating standard upon States and people who will not submit to it: the only penalty threatened is the penalty which will be due to their own fraud or folly.

State action is permitted by the Constitution for the maintenance of a just, stable, and honest standard of value. State action may be required in order to meet the threat of discredit and of dishonesty which is implied in any act for the free coinage of silver dollars of the present standard without a change in the existing national acts of legal tender. It is quite time to denounce those who promote the free coinage of silver dollars of the present standard, without change in the present acts of legal tender, as destroyers of credit; as persons who would impair contracts and who would take from the business community its liberty to make use of either metal, silver or gold, according to the will, judgment, and discretion of each of its members.

EDWARD ATKINSON.

Objection has been taken to the statement that there is no English coin named pound sterling.

The gold coins (of Great Britain) are the sovereign and the half-sovereign. Tate's "Cambist" states that "the rate of value of the pound sterling in gold is, for 1869, sovereigns coined out of forty troy pounds weight of gold $\frac{11}{12}$ fine. The full weight of a sovereign is 5 pennyweights $3\frac{171}{655}$ grains. The fine weight is $113\frac{1}{655}$ grains. The sovereign when less in weight than 5 pennyweights $2\frac{3}{4}$ grains has no legal currency."

While the corresponding coin is named "sovereign," "pound" is the legal name for such a sovereign. Contracts payable in pounds are therefore construed as being payable in sovereigns *of full weight*. Sovereigns may become light by wear: they are still sovereigns or coins in fact, but not in law. Pounds cannot become light, because the term is a legal name only for $113\frac{1}{655}$ grains of fine gold manufactured by the government into a round disk of metal named or called a "sovereign."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

INCREASE OF CRIME BY "REFORMATORY" PRISONS.

WHAT would be the result if human laws should undertake to decree that whoever offended against the well-being of the race should be rewarded, not punished? What would be the result if we should inculcate the false idea that ease, not labor, is the law of life and of enjoyment, and should teach men to be lazy by holding them in enforced idleness, and mitigating their *ennui* with entertainments and bouquets? Absurd as this proposition appears when thus baldly stated, it is the alarming fact about our later methods for the reformation of criminals, patent to every one who studies the results we have already attained by our violation of Nature's wise provisions.

Our fathers' methods of dealing with criminals were simpler than ours, and far more effectual; for the great and alarming increase of crime has set in since we forsook their wiser ways, which sought only to imitate Nature, and followed after the strange gods of the professional philanthropist. Our fathers' prisoners never desired to repeat an experience of their punitive processes. Our prisoners voluntarily return a hundred times to enjoy the delights of our reformatory methods. If a man disobeyed the laws our fathers made for the good of society, they, like Nature, inflicted physical pain, and exposed him to shame. Was he lazy, and did he neglect his family? They taught him, as Nature teaches him if we do not interrupt her beneficent processes, that he must expect physical pain, and, like Nature, they continued it until he went to work. Did he beat a helpless woman unmercifully? They taught him how it felt to lie helpless beneath the stinging lash.

Ours is a different method. We strive to prevent brutality and vagabondage by keeping the lazy brute and vagabond in luxurious idleness. We give him a better home than he has ever known, "a fruit collation every Saturday," a "brass band and negro-minstrel show" to amuse his leisure and to keep the idle time from hanging too heavily upon his weary hands. Or, if he desire a higher class of entertainment, we give him an "opportunity to listen to all the best lecturers in the field," and provide musical and literary enjoyments for him, so that he may hear "orchestral selections," "tenor solos,"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"piano solos," a "paper on philanthropy," and one on "Teneriffe;" the whole programme concluding with an "illustrated lecture and a vocal selection by the prison quartette." This is certainly travelling a long way from our fathers' crude methods; but the authority for saying that these benefits all find a place in our prison system is the unimpeachable Official Report of the Massachusetts Commissioners of Prisons, where we learn also that our "unfortunate friends'" bill of fare consists of the "best that the market affords." Some of the articles named in this weekly *menu* are as follows: tomato-soup, beef-soup, clam-chowder, baked fish with sauce, mashed potatoes, corned beef with apple-sauce, roast beef with vegetables, baked beans, brown and white bread with butter, oatmeal and milk, gingerbread, prunes and cheese, tea and coffee with milk and sugar, fruit, and cocoa. And if we turn to the Report of the Young Men's Christian Association, we shall find that he is not wholly dependent on the care of the State for his physical and æsthetic pabulum; for at Christmas and other appropriate seasons the charitable young men go to visit him, and supply him with "appropriate chromo Christmas cards." We read in the official report of the chaplain, that "on the 17th of June a bouquet of flowers was furnished each inmate of the prison by the ladies of the Flower Mission, to the great pleasure of the recipients;" that "generous gifts of fiction and other literature" will be given to the library; and that the officer in charge will request the State to expend thousands of dollars additional to these luxuries, that these "unfortunates"—who have burned dwelling-houses, outraged and violated the chastity of innocent women, broken and entered dwellings at night and put the inhabitants in fear, or by some atrocious breach of trust reduced a hundred widows and orphans to penury—may have further hours in the evening to devote themselves to the proper cultivation of the light and solid literature so kindly given them by the State and by private munificence.

And what, meanwhile, of our "unfortunate friend's" wife and children? Our fathers, on whom the light of the higher philanthropy had not yet dawned, used to take some interest in the prisoner's family. Some of the church societies have taken the matter in hand of late, we understand, and our "friends" may rest tolerably assured that their families will get on moderately well without them. They will not have roast beef and bouquets, to be sure, for they have committed no crimes which entitle them to such luxuries as we lavish on their guilty lords and masters. They have lived hard-working, commonplace, honest

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lives; but it is quite proper that this romantic being, whose kind our fathers used to whip until he went to work to win his wife's and children's bread, should be taken away from them, and treated to "the best the market affords," while his innocent family are left to beg or starve. We are not so "barbarous as our less enlightened sires," who whipped the criminal, and made him feed the innocent. "*Nous avons changé tout cela.*"

Is this a fancy picture only, the mockery of a purely philistine mind? It is information drawn not only from the personal observations of the writer in daily attendance upon the criminal courts during more than two decades, but it is vouched for by the Annual Reports of the Commissioners of Prisons made to the Legislatures of Massachusetts for the years 1886, 1887, 1888, and 1890, where all these interesting facts concerning the bodily, æsthetic, and spiritual well-being of the criminal classes of this enlightened Commonwealth, may be found, with the added information that still further work in this direction is done in the State of New York, aided and supplemented by a Ladies' Mission, which is both a "fruit and flower mission." It is interesting to note here that one of the phases of the crime of malicious mischief—the malicious injury of ornamental shrubs—is now indexed in the public statutes of Massachusetts under the head of "Æsthetics," and, until the enlarged and amended index was published, could be found only under that designation.

In justice to the officials who report this state of affairs for us, it should be said that they are in no way responsible for its existence. The philanthropist is abroad in these troubled times, and all must obey him: the official can only execute his will, and record its results.

"The punitive idea" has been scouted off the field as a relic of barbarism, fit only for the dark ages. The philanthropic associations known as "prison associations" constantly boast that they "have abolished the punitive idea;" and here they find their opportunity to realize, to a considerable extent, that dream of the socialist, and to relieve a large portion of the race from the incentives of "material necessity and material ambition."

Let us see what they have accomplished by thus improving on the methods of our wiser mother, Nature, who through these sharp reminders has spurred us on to all our best achievements in every direction.

From the Report of the Attorney-General for the year 1839 it appears that in the dark ages of 1836–38, when the punitive idea was still esteemed as valuable, and in accordance with immutable law,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

England and Wales, with a population of 14,000,000, had but 14,771 prisoners, or one to every 948 inhabitants; New York, with a population of 2,200,000, had 1,086 prisoners, or one to every 2,025 (the reformer was not then active in New York); Massachusetts, with a population of 700,000, had 852 prisoners, or one to every 822 inhabitants. The last Report of the Commissioners of Prisons, which has continued this portion of the reports of the earlier attorneys-general, shows that this proportion of prisoners to population has vastly changed. The population has only trebled; but the number of prisoners has increased fifty-fold. In the county prisons alone, excluding the State Prison and reformatories, this proportion has increased to one prisoner to every 461 inhabitants. The criminal cases in the lower courts during the year ending September 30, 1890, were in the aggregate 81,255, and in the Superior Court 2,158 more; in all, 83,413; and of this number, 33,290 were committed to the county prisons.

The question forces itself home on us here, How long will it be before, under this system of what we may be pardoned for calling "orchestral," as opposed to natural, selection, we shall reduce the proportion as much again, till it reaches a point where every single inhabitant is a prisoner? The problem is simple if the present ratio is maintained; and it is to be noted that it has been an increasing ratio. Briefly stated it is this: if in fifty years the ratio of prisoners to population has been reduced from one in 800 to one in 400, will the next fifty years take off the remaining 400? and shall we become a nation of criminals? In the city of Boston we have already made a vast stride in that direction, for from the official figures it appears that in Boston one person in every 222 was a prisoner.

This is very serious business; and when we reflect, that, with one-seventh of the population of the England of fifty years ago, Massachusetts had last year more than three times the number of prisoners, —that is, 44,908 prisoners to our 2,200,000 population, as against England's 14,771 prisoners to her 14,000,000 population, over 21 per cent more than England,—we can see how fast and how far we have drifted since we cut loose from those safe moorings of Nature, to try to better her punitive methods by something which we are pleased to call "less barbarous and more reformatory."

But do our newer methods reform? It appears from the last official report, that, out of the 33,290 prisoners committed during the last year in Massachusetts, over 17,667 were known to be recommitments, the State Farm being excluded—recommitments of persons who were so

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pleased with our "orchestras," and "chromo Christmas cards," and "bouquets," and "roast beef," and "fruit collations," that they returned to enjoy these delightful reformatory agencies again. Indeed, so fascinating do these rewards of crime become, that the wiser portion, who prefer comfort to freedom, return again and again to obtain these unwonted luxuries. It appears from these official tables, that, not counting the vast number unrecognized, 124 men and 34 women, in all 158 persons, are known to have returned for these blessings more than fifty times, and 397 persons more than thirty times. They have an old gardener at the House of Industry in Boston Harbor who has had himself committed more than a hundred times. He says he "knows when he is well off."

We learn from this same source that the State Prison at Charleston is now "our only punitive institution." This is the institution whose warden reports that the diet is constantly improving and that holiday and other privileges are increasing, as well as expenses, the last in a degree that "alarms" the warden. It is here, too, that the bouquets were "so appreciated by the recipients;" and, according to the chaplain's last report, "the library" (with its 50 per cent of fiction and 5 per cent of religious works) "stands to do its gracious, ameliorating, and helpful work as aforetime." And it is here, too, that the same chaplain reports, that "after much observation, some of which has been a source of pain, it seems proper to call attention to the fact that many men, mostly young men, acquire the habit of using tobacco after their arrival at the prison. This is not so much because they wish it as because they do not know what to do with the tobacco they have given them each week, and because every one seemingly uses it." "After all," he pathetically adds, "some never acquire the habit." The matter of expenses is assuming proportions, which, with the vast increase of commitments, will soon amount to a burden most grievous to be borne, the mere current expenses of the county prisons alone having increased from $141,999 in 1862 to $335,392 in the year 1890. The commitments to the same prison have more than doubled in number in the last nine years, the figures being 8,675 commitments to county prisons in the year 1881, as against 18,222 in the year 1890. In this last year there were also 13,828 persons committed to the Boston House of Industry, and 390 to the State Farm, concerning which we have no means of ascertaining the expenses; but the total cost of maintenance, exclusive of the cost of commitments, is evidently already well above a million dollars yearly. The fact that during the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

past year, in a population of only 2,236,943 persons, there were 80,844 arrests and 83,431 criminal prosecutions,—that is, 20,000 more than there were only nine years ago,—is highly significant. Population has increased in that period; but we must not forget that while, in the last fifty years, the population has increased from 737,700 to 2,238,-943,—that is, has about trebled,—the number of prisoners has meanwhile increased fifty-fold—852 prisoners in 1838, against 44,908 in 1890.

These are the results of an entire change of system,—a change declared to be "from punitive to reformatory," but which might be more succinctly characterized as "from punishment to bouquets." We can hardly believe that these astounding figures can represent the facts, but they are all from carefully prepared sworn official reports by officers who have no inducement to misrepresent them. When we read in them that "the prison is yet to be built where the men shall earn their living," and that large numbers must be kept in idleness for want of space and opportunities to supply them with work, and when we consider what unusual luxuries roast beef and fruit and flowers are to the persons who inhabit these quiet retreats of elegant leisure, we may feel less inclined to doubt their accuracy.

The friends of the present system agree that "austerity and severity must pervade the prison place," and that "the prisoner must go out persuaded that the way of the transgressor is hard." One cannot but wonder, however, if the 158 persons known to have returned to prison more than fifty times fully appreciate the force of these two admirable statements from their own extended experience of the prison place and of the way of the transgressor.

In this connection the writer must be pardoned for digressing a moment from these formal reports to some facts of his own observation during the last twenty years, in which he has daily assisted in the administration of the criminal law. Taking a warm interest in the abiding welfare of the prisoners who have come before his notice, he has striven to preserve such as he could from the experiences of jail life, and has put forth considerable energies in this direction. Lately he called the attention of three stalwart young men charged with vagrancy to the fact that the effect of their appeal was to double their confinement from four months to eight months. Quick as a flash came back the answer, "Don't you suppose we know what we are about? That is just what we want!" Volumes of commentary could not tell more about the effect of the "bouquet system," if we may be permitted to call it so, though perhaps "roast-beef orchestral" would more

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

happily describe some features of our present method. Several times the prisoners have complained to the writer that the officers have made a mistake in copying their *mittimuses*, and not given them time enough. Here is a complaint of this character last made to him: "I have got but two months, and I am entitled to four. Please have it altered for me: I want all four months that I was sentenced for." Again: meeting in a county prison a physician sentenced for two years for malpractice, the writer was astounded with this conversation. The prisoner was a man who had been noted for his enjoyment of the luxuries of existence. He said, "It is a great mistake you fellows make in thinking you are inflicting punishment when you send men here. I have been here a year, and can truly say I have enjoyed it so much that I shall not feel sorry if my pardon is not obtained. You see, it has been vacation, with just enough to do to amuse me. The novels in the prison library are entertaining, and I am very fond of dominoes and checkers, and find some first-rate players among the men. Now, if it strikes me in this way, who have been accustomed to every luxury, how must it be to the poor devils who never have a square meal outside? Do you wonder that they flock by hundreds and thousands to the jails in winter? My only surprise is, that you can keep any of them out at all." This is the opinion of an educated man who has experienced the benefits of the system in his own person, and finds them "delightful,"—a life from which he is loath to part. But it is evident that it is far from the "austerity and severity" which once did "pervade the prison place;" and it will be hard from this to realize the good man's desire of "impressing the prisoner with the idea that the way of the transgressor is hard."

We have confined our attention to the working of the "reformatory system" as opposed to the "punitive system" in Massachusetts, because the tendency is here perhaps the most apparent, though the good chaplain of "our only punitive institution" regrets that we cannot extend our missions to the prisoners from flowers to fruit as well, on the New York principle. But at another time we may find opportunity to compare the work and results in New York, which are very similar to the state of affairs criminal in Massachusetts, with the results of the older system in Delaware, where they still believe in applying the methods of Nature,—the gospel of hard work and the infliction of physical pain on the wrong-doer until he learns to care for the helpless innocents who should be dependent upon his manly exertions, rather than leave them to the choice of starvation or the poor-house, as is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

now too often the pitiable lot of the women and children from whom we take the bread-winner for seclusion and reformation.

Not that the reformatory idea is by any means to be derided. The Massachusetts Reformatory and the parent institution at Elmira, New York, are doing a great work in their systems of compulsory education, especially in the direction of industrial education; and the Massachusetts Reformatory is in very able hands, but it is evident from the official reports of the institution that the "austerity and severity," which the superintendent truly says should "pervade the prison place," are not as yet its distinguishing features. Amusements and better food than the prisoner can obtain by his own exertions, little or nothing to do, and entire freedom from the struggle for existence—these are the features which make the prison place an asylum already eagerly sought by thousands every year. If these attractions continue to increase as they have during the last two decades, we may find that it will not take another fifty years to reduce the remaining half of that ratio of prisoners to population, half of which ratio, as we have already seen, has disappeared in the preceding fifty years.

Thus by this strange road we may arrive at that goal of our Nationalist friends. The State will have acquired complete control of all our persons and actions, and we shall no longer struggle for existence, because the State will supply all our wants. For how large a proportion of the population it has already done this, we have seen. In spite of all the lingering prejudice against prison life, one man in every 222 in Boston is philosophic enough gladly to accept the blessings already offered him. The inmates of the so-called "Boston House of Industry" are taught to join in a song aptly expressing a sentiment that soon must have universal application; for at the rate at which we are now progressing we shall in time all seek this socialistic heaven, and resign our responsibilities to the fostering care of "our country:"—

> "Upon thy mighty faithful heart
> We lay our burdens down;
> Thou art the only friend who feels
> Their weight without a frown."

The prisoners sing this degrading sentiment with great gusto, as if they appreciated its force as applied to themselves; and they may well do so. It is the lesson our whole system best inculcates. Are the manly duties of life a burden? Lay this burden down upon the country. You have but to disobey her laws, and your country will assume your obligations, clothe and feed you, as you have never been fed be-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fore by your own exertions, on roast beef and gingerbread, and supply you with "the best the market affords," free of charge. Meanwhile you will be excused from all labor, or given only enough light work to entertain you; and the Society for Aiding Prisoners' Families will take care of your wife and children, or, if they are in danger of starving, the town will take care of them.

How many good children should we have in the family if we gave a child a piece of gingerbread every time it was naughty, in the hope that it would be touched by our kindness, and become good? Yet this is literally what we do in our present "penal" system. We have softened our penalties until they are rewards of demerit. If a man is naturally lazy, we make him lazier by supporting him in idleness. Is he vicious, we give him gingerbread and a brass band as a reward for his viciousness. The only penalty which he still feels as a penalty is a fine, which his family feel more than he feels; and many men escape this by serving time in jail in preference to paying the fine. We talk of the disgrace of going to jail, and the loss of freedom; but the sense of disgrace vanishes with the first imprisonment, and the loss of freedom is not felt, accompanied as it is with unusual luxuries. "Four months," exclaimed a prisoner on being sentenced: "what's that? Why, it is less than a salt-voyage, and a great deal easier." "I would gladly go to jail for ten days," said a gentleman who knew of the management of our prisons, "if by so doing I could find myself in Europe. I should infinitely prefer it to the confinement and disagreeable features of a sea-voyage." Many men every year, finding themselves in need of quiet and medical aid, voluntarily seek the seclusion that the jails afford. And for a host of vagabonds it has already become a winter palace, where they regularly hibernate till it is more agreeable out of doors again. A country justice whom the writer knew had a regular *clientèle* of some forty of these wise animals, who, as soon as they were recognized and turned out of snug harbor, would return, and swell his revenue by obtaining a new commitment. One epicurean philosopher, who once characterized himself on leaving the dock as "a thief and a murderer," has for twenty years laid the whole burden of his miserable existence upon the faithful heart of the country, and not once experienced a frown. His ideal of happiness is a wild debauch, for which his pension supplies the funds, and which he keeps up until he is exhausted, and needs rest and medical aid, when the county takes the burden off the hands of the State and of the United States, and neatly cleans and puts away his "batting suit,"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

his only property, till he is ready to go on another spree. Meanwhile he is cosseted and patched up again, and clothed and fed and doctored, till the funds at his disposal enable him to enjoy his liberty, when the same round continues. Thus we foster his vicious propensities to the utmost, and it is a striking example of the tendency of our present system. We reward crime and constantly encourage it, instead of punishing and sternly repressing it, as our fathers did; and this enormous increase of fifty-fold, while the population has only trebled, is the natural result. We have spared the rod, and substituted the piece of gingerbread. Our fathers' homely proverb warns us that this is the way to spoil the child; and the truth of their pregnant maxim is but too painfully apparent in our gorged jails, to which hundreds of the same prisoners return voluntarily and delightedly for thirty, fifty, or a hundred times.

Shall we, then, punish crime? or offer rewards for it? Is it either wise or safe to continue on the path which is so swiftly leading us to destruction?

WILLIAM P. ANDREWS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

AGRICULTURAL DEPRESSION AND WASTE OF TIME.

"THE gods for labor give us all good things." This was part of the philosophy of the ancient Greeks. They learned it as a fact of experience long before Epicharmus first put it into words. Over and over again each generation of men tries its own experiments, and comes back to the same unvarying conclusion. In a thousand forms in all languages, this idea has found its way into the wisdom of men. It is a part of the same experience, that the gods never give any thing worth having for any other price. In their dealings with men they have no other coinage: they know no other measure of value. Temporary loans they sometimes grant; but, when the day of payment comes, they do not fail to charge their due rate of interest. They never change their valuations, and they never forget.

"By their long memories, the gods are known." This proverb, like the other, has its source in a universal experience. Taken from the forms of classic poetry, and cast in the language of to-day, it indicates simply the universality of law. When they spoke of the gods in phrases like these, the Greeks meant what we in a different way personify as "the forces of nature," the powers about us which act unceasingly, and in ways which never change.

Human knowledge consists in the recognition of these ways and forces. Human power depends on acting in accord with such knowledge. In this lie the possibilities of man. He who knows the truth can trust all, and fear nothing. There is no treachery in Nature's laws. He who strikes as the gods strike has the force of infinity in his blows. He who defies them wields a club of air. These laws are real and are universal, and no man or nation has ever actually accomplished any thing which the gods have decreed that he should not.

The existence of the simplest of these laws, those which, like the law of gravitation, can be mathematically determined, people in general now readily admit. The man who leaps from a precipice does not expect to avoid contusion when he comes in contact with the earth at the bottom. The law of falling bodies is too easily seen to leave any room for doubt. But the laws of organic life are less simple than

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

these; and the laws we but half understand we hope in some way to avoid. Most difficult of all, because dealing with the most complicated of relations, are the laws of ethics and economics. And because these laws are not easily understood and the relations of cause and effect imperfectly traced, the average man believes that he is shrewd enough to break them, and avoid their penalty.

It is safe to say, that, when suffering exists in a rich country and a productive civilization like ours, there has preceded it a violation of some economic law. Perhaps more than one law has been violated, and in many different ways. Perhaps the sufferer is himself the offender; perhaps he is the temporary victim of wrong by others. Perhaps all these conditions exist together among the complex evils of our civilization, and the task of disentanglement may be one of hopeless difficulty.

Just now the people of this country are suffering from an attack of "agricultural depression." The farmers are having a hard time. In the industrial world there is something wrong, and the farmers are the victims. There is no doubt of the fact. The land is as rich as it ever was, the sun shines and the rain falls, but still farming does not pay. Mortgages are growing where once forests grew, and with greater rapidity; and many of our best farms, both East and West, can be bought for the bare cost of their buildings. There are other depressions more or less evident among other classes of workers, and particularly among those who have taken to themselves a leisure which they have never earned. The men who through lack of skill or lack of frugality are wasting time are filled with dissatisfaction or suffering, while those who have been engaged in one way or another in the organized saving of human effort are disproportionately powerful.

Part of the suffering of farmers is plainly due to unjust laws and unequal taxation. The farmer has failed to make his influence felt. The pressure of great public interests in the period of the war and of reconstruction has caused him to forget his own. While he slept the enemy has sown tares in his tax-laws, and he awakes to find the weight of the machinery of state, as well as the greater weight of the various abuses not yet eliminated from popular government, largely transferred from the shoulders of others to his own.

But, emphasize this as we may, the inequalities of taxation cannot alone cause an "agricultural depression." Inordinate pensions, wasteful subsidies, the tyranny of capital—all these together could not create it, if the farmer himself were not in some degree at fault. In any

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

event, the remedy for this is in the farmer's own hands. Let him locate the injury, and strike a strong blow at its cause. Meanwhile in striking let him look at himself to see what part of the blame is due to his own weakness, and lack of foresight.

It is a law of economics that decline and degradation follow the loss of self-activity. There is no pardon for the crime of the man who wastes his own time. There is no sure prosperity except at the price of some one's work. It is true that under human laws it often happens that those the world calls fortunate have the luck of foxes and wolves, and can show no moral claim to the game they are devouring. Yet, even with all defects of law or of society, is it not true that in the long-run each of us, so far as the world's treasures are concerned, gets just about what he deserves? Sickness and accident aside, who ever heard of a poor man in America who has not in some way fairly earned his poverty? Accident aside, who ever heard of a poor man who could or would pay the price of wealth? To be poor is not the greatest of evils: it is an evil only from the standpoint of economics. Many a poor man is poor simply because he has intelligently refused to pay the price which wealth would cost, and has turned his labor into channels which brought him only spiritual or mental gain. But these are satisfied with their bargain, and not one of them is aware that any wrong has been done to him. He has what he has paid for, and asks for nothing else, and we who know him as our neighbor never think of him as poor. He could wish for wealth only as a means of securing a more perfect poverty.

"The gods for labor give us all good things," but not all to the same man. Each must choose for himself, and it is a happy condition that each one who has earned the right to choose is satisfied with his choice. Those who have not earned this right must, from the nature of things, be discontented. The man who has wasted his time must take the last choice: he comes in for the little that is left. With the leisure of life all spent in advance, the interest on borrowed time must be paid under the hardest of creditors.

Henry George tells us that poverty is the "relentless hell" that yawns beneath civil society. So it is; and a similar comparison may be made in the case of the penalty which follows the violation of any other law of ethics or economics. "By their long memories the gods are known." Under their laws we live, and beneath us forever yawn their penalties. But we may change this metaphor a little. Is it not true that this "yawning, relentless hell" is due to the presence among

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

us of the yawning, relentless horde of men who would gain something for nothing? These are the source of pauperism. They are the cause of poverty; and, in whatever form of industry their presence is felt, it is felt as an "industrial depression."

In other words, whatever the other factors and subsidiary causes may be, the natural penalty for laziness is one of the important elements in what we call our "agricultural depression." A notion has been spreading among our country-people that the dwellers in towns do "not have to work to make a living, or do not have to work hard;" and the farmer is coming to think that "the day of hard labor has passed, or ought to pass." The agricultural laborer is taking his rest; and the gods are charging him a heavy interest on the time he has borrowed.

Not long ago I crossed the rich State of Indiana on a railway-train. It makes no difference where or in what direction. It was on a bright day in April, when the sun shone on the damp earth, and one could almost hear the growing of the grass. There are days and days like this, which every farmer-boy can remember,—days which brought to him the perfection of being, but which brought also their duties of ploughing and planting and sowing. The hope of the spring was in the work. The days were too short for the duties which crowded, and the right to rest could come only when the grain was in the ground, where the forces of nature would wake it into life. An hour to-day in the growing spring is worth a week in the hot mid-summer, and he must be a poor farmer indeed who does not realize this.

I was impressed that day with the freedom of the farmer. He deals with Nature through no middle-man. Nowhere is forethought and intelligence better paid than in our dealings with mother Earth. She is as honest as eternity, and she never fails to meet the just dues of those who have claims upon her. She returns some fifty-fold, some hundred-fold, for all that is intrusted to her—never fifty-fold to him who deserves a hundred.

Just then the train stopped for a moment at the flag-station of Cloverdale, a name which suggests fragrant blossoms amid all sorts of agricultural prosperity. A commercial traveller, dealing in groceries and tobacco, got off; a crate of live chickens was put on; and the cars started again. The stopping of a train was no rare sight in that village, for it happens two or three times every day. The people had no welcome for the commercial traveller, no tears were shed over the departure of the chickens; yet on the station-steps I counted forty men

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and boys who were there when the train came in,—farm boys, who ought to have been at work in the fields; village boys, who might have been doing something somewhere, every interest of economics and æsthetics alike calling them away from the village, and off to the farms.

Two men attended to all the business of the station. The solitary passenger went his own way. The rest were there because they had not the moral strength to go anywhere else. They stood there on the station-steps, embodied ghosts, dead to all life and hope, with only force enough to stand around and gape.

At my destination I left the train, and, going to the hotel, I passed on a street-corner the noisy vender of a rheumatism cure; and sixty men and boys who had no need for cures of any kind, for they were already dead, were standing around with mouths open, and brains shut, engaged in killing time. I was sorry to see that most of these were farmers. And all this time their neglected farms lay bathed in the sunlight, the earth ready to rejoice only at the touch of a hoe.

Not long after I had occasion to cross a village square. I saw many busy men upon it,—men who had a right to be there, because they were there on their own business. Each one does his share in the great task of caring for the world when he is able and willing to care for himself. On the corner of the square a wandering beggar with a cracked accordion sent forth strains of doleful music. The people stood around him like flies around a drop of molasses. An hour later I returned. The accordion and its victims were still there, as if chained to the spot. The bird-lime of habitual idleness was on their feet, and they could not get away. They will never get away. They will stay there forever. The mark of doom is on them. They are victims of the "agricultural depression."

In these days, the farmer has many grievances of which he did not know a generation past. The newspapers and the stump-speakers tell us of the farmer's wrongs, and from time to time huge alliances are formed to set them right. I go back to the old farm in New York on which I was born,—the farm my father won from the forest, and on which he lived in freedom and independence, knowing no master, dreading no tyrant. With poorer tools than are now used, poorer buildings, inferior facilities for transportation, lower prices, and uncertain markets, still he knew nothing of "agricultural depression." When crops were small and prices low, he simply worked the harder. I find on that farm to-day tenants who barely make a living. I go

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

over the farm. I see unpruned fruit-trees, wasted forest-trees, farm-implements rusting in the rain and sun, falling gates, broken wagons, —evidences of wasted time and unthrifty labor. I wonder whether the oppression of the farmer is the fault of the times, or the fault of the man.

An old woman I once knew in the Tennessee mountains expressed a great economic truth in these words: "Poor folks has poor ways." Too often it is the poorness of their own ways, not the aggression of wealthy neighbors, which has plunged these folk into poverty. If a man spend a day in the harvest-time in efforts to send a fool to the Legislature, or a knave to Congress, should he complain if the laws the fools and knaves make add to his own taxes? Who but he is to blame, if the laws ostensibly made in his interest simply shift the burden from one of his shoulders to the other? If he stand all day in the public square spell-bound by a tramp with an accordion, or, still worse, if he lounge about on the sawdust floor of a saloon, talking the vile stuff we agree to call "politics," never reading a book, never thinking a thought, above the level of the sawdust floor, need he be surprised if his opinions do not meet with respect? It is not cheaper money the farmer needs, but dearer men,—men whose time is money, and whose labor is worth the labor of other men,—men who know how to do the best things in the best way, and can thereby do their part in alleviating "industrial depression."

"A nation," it has been wisely said, "is an assemblage of men and women who can take care of themselves." Whatever influence strengthens this power in the individual makes the nation strong; and, conversely, the presence of every man or woman who does not or can not render the equivalent of such care casts an additional burden on the rest. This power of self-support rests on the saving of the individual time. Dr. Franklin calculated, that, if every man and woman should spend three or four hours each day in useful occupation, poverty would disappear, and the afternoon of each day and the whole afternoon of our lives could then be reserved for physical, mental, or spiritual improvement. That we cannot thus have the afternoon to ourselves is due to the fact that we are paying our neighbor's debts. Our neighbor has taken our time. We are doing more than our share of the drudgery that hinders growth, and this, because others in the same community are doing too little.

I can well remember the time when the farmer was a busy man. There is many a farm to-day on which he is still busy. It does not

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

take a close observer to recognize these farms. You can tell them as far as you can see. Their owners are in alliance with the forces of nature. The gods are on their side, and they need no help from politicians. Their butter sells for money; their oats are clean; their horses are in demand; whatever they touch is genuine and prosperous. The cattle call the farmer up at dawn; the clover needs him in the morning, the apples and potatoes in the afternoon; the corn must be husked at night. A busy man the old-time farmer was; and, being busy, he found time for every thing. He read bound books; he enjoyed the pleasures of travel; he educated his family; he kept intelligent watch on all the affairs of the day. He did not find time to stand on the station-steps in the middle of the afternoon to watch a thousand trains go by on a thousand consecutive days. He carried no handicap load of tobacco and whiskey. He went to the county-seat when he had business there: he went with clean clothes, and came back with a clean conscience. He had not time to spend each seventh day on the court-house square, talking the dregs of scandal and politics with men whose highest civic conception is balanced by a two-dollar bill; nor had he time to waste on nostrum venders, or vagrants with accordions.

I hear the farmers complaining to-day of high tariffs, and it may be that they have a right to complain: still no tax on iron was ever so great as the tax he pays who leaves his mowing-machine unsheltered in the storm. The tax on land is high; but he pays a higher tax who leaves his meadows to grow up to white-weed and thistles. The tax for good roads is high; but a higher toll is paid by the farmer who goes each week to town in mud knee-deep to his horses. There is a high tax on personal property; but it is not so high as the tax on time which is paid by the man who spends his Saturdays loitering about the village streets. All the farmer's income arises from the wise use of his time. One-sixth of his time means one-sixth of his income. If he has learned to make use of his time, all other ills will cure themselves.

Mowing-machines, threshers, harvesters, and all the array of contrivances produced by the ingenuity of a labor-saving age, are burdens and not helps to the farmer, if the labor they save be turned into unproductive channels. Labor-saving machinery is the costliest of luxuries, if the time preserved is lost again in idleness or dissipation.

I know a thrifty farmer who pays twenty-five cents a day less to those of his hands who work in the fields nearest the railroad. This he does because these workmen stop whenever the trains go by, and so

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

they lose one-sixth of their working-time. This may be equally true of men who work for themselves. I know a hundred farmers who lose regularly one-sixth of their time by needless visits to the county-seat and in making those visits needlessly long. One-sixth of their time means one-sixth of their income, or else their whole time is not worth saving. It is this sixth which represents the difference between poverty and prosperity. If this wasted sixth were saved by every farmer in Indiana, that State would be an education of itself. People would come from the ends of the earth to see the land which had solved the labor question.

But it may be that their own valuation is a just one. Perhaps there are some farmers whose time has no economic value. There are other such in every community,—the idiot, the insane, the broken, the criminal. For these, great hospitals are maintained, because they can be more cheaply supported in public lodgings at the common cost. Shall we add the farmer to this list? Why not have a great public hospital for all men with valueless time,—a great square courtyard, covered with sawdust, with comfortable dry-goods boxes, where they might sit for the whole day and the whole year, talking politics to the music of the hand-organ, and watching the trains go by? The rest of the world could then go on with the world's work, with some addition, no doubt, to the taxes, but with the corresponding gain in having the streets open, the saloons closed, the demagogue silenced, and the pastures free from weeds and thistles.

The frost is a great enemy to "agricultural depression." Its sharp tooth is a spur to human activity. Where butterflies freeze in the fall, sturdier insects are sure to be produced. I know a land where the frost never comes, and where not one-sixth, but six-sixths, of every man's time is devoted to any purpose rather than that of attending to his own affairs. It is Nature's great hospital for the incurably lazy. The life of Mexico is summed up in one word, *mañana*, "to-morrow." To-morrow let us do it: we must eat and sleep to-day. "*Mañana por la mañana*," one hears over and over again at every suggestion involving the slightest effort. "It is too warm to-day; the sunshine is too bright, the shade too pleasant: *mañana* let it be." This is the land where nothing is ever done. Why should we do things when to rest, and not to do, is so much pleasanter? There is the endless succession of to-morrows. They have come on to us since eternity, and surely they will continue to come. Let us rest in the shade, and wait for the next to-morrow.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In this paper I have made no attempt to give a complete analysis of all the causes of the evil plight which has befallen our farmers. I have no palliation for unequal taxes, unjust discriminations, or any form of injustice to any man. If the farmer is the victim of any of these, it is his privilege and his duty to set matters right. Even though some of his attempts recall the fine discrimination of the bull in the china shop,—as when he votes for bad roads, cheap money, and crippled public schools,—there is no occasion for discouragement. He will know better than this when his eyes are fairly opened. But no legislation will amount to much until each farmer shall feel himself responsible for his own "industrial depression." He must do his work with intelligence and economy. He must spend nothing which he has not earned, be it time or be it money, and must not do in a poor way whatever can be done in a better.

In the progress of civilization, agriculture, like every other form of industry, must tend to become a profession. Brain-work must be behind hand-work. The advance of civilization means the elimination of unskilled labor. The man who does not know and does not care how farming should be carried on has no right to pretend to be a farmer. Whatever human laws may do, the laws of the gods will not leave him long in possession of the ground. Sooner or later, by the operation of these inexorable laws, the farmer who does not realize the importance of knowing his business, and attending to it, must let go his hold upon the earth. The process of change of worse men for better must always appear as an "industrial depression." For this suffering there is but one certain remedy. In the words of a successful farmer whom I know: "Let other people's affairs alone, mind your own business, and you will have prosperity."

DAVID STARR JORDAN.

PALO ALTO, Cal., September 1, 1891.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE NEEDS OF OUR ARMY AND NAVY.

We Americans are not a military people. In view of our having carved our way into the wilderness with sword as well as with axe, of our having won our independence by arms, of our having come with abundant credit out of all our wars, of having carried through one of the most gigantic struggles of modern days, in which were fought battles almost unequalled in tenacity, this may appear to be an unwarranted statement. But it is true. It requires more than courage, more than ability to raise, to equip, to ration, to move, and to command armies, to make a military people. The most splendid conduct in war for an all-absorbing cause does not suffice. Having many of the essential qualities, we yet fall short of what the Romans were, the Germans are. Some sections of the country approach nearer to the military standard; but, taken as a whole, our lack of interest in army and navy, our thoroughly unbusiness-like way of handling our national problems of attack and defence, stamp us as the least military in our instincts of all the great peoples of the earth.

No nation so jealous of a standing army can claim to be a military people. Were it not a matter to bewail, it would be a fit subject for laughter, to see 60,000,000 self-reliant Americans looking askance at an army of 25,000 men as a possible menace to republican institutions—one blue-coat in every 144 square miles of our territory! And yet, after the cry of economy, this is not only the reason most commonly urged on the floor of Congress for its scant support of the army, but it is the feeling of the bulk of the population. A military people takes pride in its national defenders; it recognizes that it is the statesman who makes war, the soldier who secures peace; its uniform is an honor. With us the professional soldier is unconsidered and the enlisted man wears his army blue as if it were a badge of ostracism.

The matter herein summarized is constantly discussed by military men, and has been the subject of many reports to Congress and the heads of Departments. It has been canvassed with special authority in the "Journal of the Military Service Institution" and in the "Proceedings of the United States Naval Institute, to which the reader is referred for detailed treatment.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The fact that our militia has its annual encampment with unstinted fuss and feathers is referable more to holiday skylarking than to any love of its military significance. If the encampment entailed sacrifices, it would soon be voted obnoxious.

We Americans are the most extravagant of economists. Statistics demonstrate that annual appropriations during the past hundred years for an army and a navy commensurate with our national standing and needs would have been twice saved in forestalling wars, shortening their duration, and preventing the destruction of incalculable amounts of private property. Indeed, the actual sums paid out for sudden and therefore costly levies in times of danger, not to count the losses incident to insufficient preparation, would have kept up a respectable force on land and sea, and have made a frequent saving in national disgrace. Despite the fact that when we put our hands to the plough we do not look back, our military history is one of blunders. Perhaps this is inseparable from our being "a nation of debaters." In time of peace we have never prepared for war. A war once ended, its lessons have been forgotten, and with true American assurance we have again turned to reliance on our isolated position and superabundant resources. To our population of arms-bearing men, unequalled in adaptiveness, we have given no opportunity to learn the duty to which, under the law, every American is liable. We educate our people compulsorily; but we do not so train them to arms. We have been wont to rely on crude militia, and have suffered the usual penalty.

The experience gained in the Revolutionary War was not lasting. Economy was a paramount reason for cutting down the military establishment; but not to speak of the wasteful method of its increase in 1798 on the threat of a war with France, and the peace we bought with Algiers, the parsimony of Jefferson and of Madison found us ready in 1812 to plunge into another war with England, with an army of 10,000 men (half of them raw recruits) and 17 vessels. The regulars were speedily increased by 25,000, but both the officers and the men were new and inefficient. All told, during the War of 1812, a quarter of a million of men were mustered into service, and yet such was the management that there were but three battles in which 5,000 Americans fought. The appointment of political generals and the conduct of the militia, some of which refused to serve out of its own State, brought about humiliations such as the surrender of Hull and the burning of the capital of a nation of 8,000,000 people by a force of 4,000 invaders. That militia did such good service at New Orleans

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was due to the Western riflemen in the ranks, the influence of a strong commander, and the excellence of the defensive position. The regulars and the volunteers who were assimilated to them uniformly fought well when once inured to discipline; and the conduct of our navy and privateers redeemed the struggle. The economies of Jefferson had reduced the national debt in ten years by $40,000,000; but the war cost $100,000,000 and 30,000 lives, not to mention the immense destruction of property. Had the money thus wasted been spent in a judicious fostering of army and navy, not only might the War of 1812 have been short and successful, but the national reputation would have been untarnished. That England had her hands full with the Napoleonic wars explains our escape from a more protracted struggle. Because American intelligence, enterprise, and gallantry saved us from disaster then, it will not do to rely upon it now.

After the War of 1812, the army and navy were for some years kept on a higher level, and it seemed as if the army, instead of being a mere national police force, was really to be placed where it could play its proper *rôle* as a nucleus for a suitable reserve; but in 1821 both arms of the service were again cut down, and in 1835 the threatened war with France found us unprepared. The $20,000,000 spent on the Seminole War would have been more wisely disbursed in forestalling its outbreak by a suitable military force.

The Mexican War next surprised us without army and navy worthy the name. But though the regulars were promptly increased to 27,000, and 75,000 volunteers were raised, the war resulted in our favor mainly because we had a weak enemy. If Scott had been faced by good troops, would he have entered the city of Mexico with 11,000 men? His pluck and skill wrested success from the most desperate of ventures. Ability and heroism stood in inverse ratio to national management.

The usual reduction followed the Mexican War; and in 1861 the most terrible war of modern times burst upon us with an army of 14,000 regulars and a navy of 90 vessels, of which 42 were in commission. Except that the South had to create its military resources, and that the North rose as one man for the preservation of the Union, the result might have been even more costly. It demands small arithmetic to cipher out the difference in the cost of suppressing the Rebellion, if there had been a regular army, or reserves of respectable size, to put into the field at the outset, and a regular navy capable of commanding the Southern ports.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

We are supposed to be a peaceful nation, but we have had our fair share of strife, foreign and domestic. Since the Revolution there have been wars with England and with Mexico, with Tripoli and with Algiers; broils with Paraguay and Corea, and a gigantic civil war; rumors of wars with France, England, Spain, and Italy. There have been the John Brown raid, the Barnburner and Fenian raids to Canada, many incursions across the Mexican border, and the filibustering expeditions to Cuba and Nicaragua. We have had the Whiskey and Shays rebellions, the election, draft, railroad, reconstruction, and sundry serious city riots; we have had well on to two hundred deadly Indian fights and many awful massacres. We have lost more men in active war since 1776 than any nation of Europe. This is a startling record for a peaceful people.

History demonstrates that the ocean is no preventive of imbroglios with foreign nations, it is scarcely probable that our national spirit of antagonism will decrease: it is bred in the bone. That we are not likely to be led into foreign complications is true; that we may be so has been recently shown by the New Orleans episode. The Monroe doctrine is capable of volcanic action, and there are many inflammable subjects on which we have no national patience. That no enemy could hold himself in the long-run on American soil is indisputable; but can we afford to face the initial damage which a better prepared opponent could inflict upon us?

What is this damage? How can it be avoided? Is it cheaper to avoid it, or to take the risk of its occurring and keep our money for political log-rolling? We have got along so far without army or navy, it is said, and pretty well. Granted, but at high cost. Are we ready to pay in increased proportion in the future?

The probability of attack is remote—very remote. This is not the cry of an alarmist. It is an assembling of patent facts from which every one may draw his own conclusions. No European nation can well afford a war at arm's-length with constant danger at its own threshold. Such a war might furnish an occasion for jealous neighbors to assert themselves. England, for instance, is not only unlikely to become involved in serious variance with the United States, but we have the Geneva arbitration as a precedent to avert war under almost any circumstances; her people rely upon us largely for food; and her manufacturers, whose best customers we are, would suffer disastrously in a war in which, in the end, England would unquestionably be the greater loser. War is high priced. In these days,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

when every shot from a big gun consumes $1,000, the prudent nation, before declaring war, sitteth down and counteth the cost thereof. Few nations can afford our American extravagances. But if our wealth is a security to us, in it also lurks a temptation to others. Improbable as war is, in times of national excitement reason is often shelved. The improbable is constantly happening. War may come.

That the danger of fire to his homestead is but one in several hundred does not prevent a prudent householder from insuring it. For the same reason, and for the further one that a well-prepared nation is rarely attacked, is it not the part of wisdom to insure our commerce and our coast cities? The sum to be spent, practically to insure what is now open to destruction in war, amounts to but a small premium on the property covered, payable once for all. One per cent of what is at risk will pay for its permanent insurance by suitable defences, and a small annual outlay will keep up the protection.

There is another method of insurance which may prove cheaper. In all foreign complications, and these are sure to come if war does not, let us put our pride in our pocket, and stand and deliver whenever the demand is made by a well-armed opponent. This peace-at-any-price system may work; but, apart from the question of its economy, does it suit our national character? Can we Americans live with our eagle hooded?

That our frontier is at present open to easy attack no one attempts to deny. The facts are public property; but few people know just what this means. Not one of our national seaports has the means to resist the approach of a modern battle-ship. We no longer live in the age when hastily constructed earthworks and a few mortars and field-batteries might defend a city against vessels held under fire by *chevaux-de-frise*, booms, or chains stretched across the mouth of its harbor; when a town might stand a bombardment of many days, and yet suffer slight damage; when it took six weeks or longer for a fleet to cross the Atlantic. Means of national defence are no longer to be improvised: they consume years to create. Time is of the essence. The modern monitor cannot be put afloat in ninety days. Money, however lavish the outlay, will not accomplish it, nor ability of the highest order compass it; the nation, rising *en masse* to resist aggression, is powerless without time. Money and ability and patriotism are essential; in every American emergency they have come to the fore. But time cannot be cajoled. It is this truth that Prussia has so well understood.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

To give an instance. In two weeks after a declaration of war, England could place 50 gunboats on the Lakes, and more than 30 armored vessels in the harbors of our leading cities, and could concentrate 75,000 regular troops in Canada, backed by a sturdy militia ready to march across our border; while in twice that time part of her Asiatic squadron could sail through the Golden Gate.

Our lake frontier is a cobweb. We are bound by the treaty of 1817 to keep on the Lakes not exceeding four vessels of a hundred tons burden, each armed with one eighteen-pounder cannon! No land defences of such towns as Chicago, situated on the shore itself, could save them from bombardment. Neither do defences exist, nor, if they existed, have we suitable ordnance or forces to arm and man them. The best army could not protect Chicago against a mediocre modern fleet. Torpedoes are not available without shore defences to back them. Indeed, so much stress is not to-day laid on the efficiency of a torpedo system; torpedo-netting twenty-five feet from the hull of a vessel has been shown to all but nullify the danger of the explosion of the largest. Torpedoes and submarine mines are excellent auxiliaries to big guns on land. Fear of them and the time taken in their removal hold the enemy under fire, but they do not stand alone. At best they are an uncertain arm.

If we are holden to this trivial force on the Lakes, say you, so is Canada. True; but Canada, under the guise of commercial desirability, has built a strategic system of canals, along which England can float from the sea to the Lakes gunboats of considerable tonnage and heavily armed, and she has more than 100 such vessels available. The shipping and commerce of the Lakes is attractive. The goods afloat and ashore suffice to pay a huge war indemnity. They are all at the mercy of an English flotilla.

Some people imagine that modern war has been humanized out of such measures as bombardment. But Paris was bombarded in 1870; so was Strassburg, and its beautiful cathedral spire was seriously injured. War has no æsthetic maxims. The occupation of a seaport leaves no alternative but submission and the payment of a heavy ransom—or bombardment. In a town like Chicago this would be followed by fire, and we all remember the $200,000,000 lost in the fire of 1871.

On our side not only are we by treaty bound to have no efficient war-vessels on the Lakes, but we have no means of placing them there. So far as land-forces go, the Canadian militia is as good as ours. We

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

often hear of our vast army of veterans, forgetful of the fact that the youngest of the veterans of the civil war is a man of fifty to-day; that their average age is fifty-six. While between 1865 and 1880 we had a reserve of available veterans to call upon, to-day not only are all these men superannuated, but even the lads who were under age in 1861 are now graybeards. The fact is that we have but 3,000 regulars in the division of the Atlantic, plus the militia. England has a large number of regular officers to detail on such a duty. She has fast passenger-steamers in abundance (Cunard, Inman, White Star, and others) to transport troops, with battle-ships to back them. Military stores and arms are plentiful in Canada, or easily sent from the home depots. In all these matters we are unequipped. Our northern frontier, *quoad* England, is absolutely open. Does the improbability of damage justify us in failure to provide against its possibility?

The remedy lies in our own hands, but it calls for time. We, as well as Canada, can build canals large enough to float gunboats, and hold these in readiness to be transported to the Lakes. We can buy or build guns and torpedoes. We can do what is feasible toward fortifying the lake-cities. We can erect works at such points as to prevent the passage of certain narrows by a fleet approaching the Lakes from the sea. "Fort Wayne on the Detroit River, if supplied with suitable armament well placed, could, with the assistance of submarine mines and torpedoes, prohibit a passage into Lake Huron," reports the Fortification Board; and "the fort at Rouse's Point is sufficient, with the aid of a few eight-inch rifles, to secure Lake Champlain from an inroad." Forts can be so placed on the St. Lawrence as to command parts of the Canadian canals and locks. Other parts of these canals are not to be reached except by a raid; but our people are apt at such work, and judicious preparation for such a venture could be made. We have built the nucleus of a fleet. So far as it goes, the White Squadron is a credit to us. Its presence at the mouth of the St. Lawrence in case of danger would have some effect. But it is small compared to the fleet England would send there, and cruisers are not battle-ships.

Our seacoast defences to-day amount to nothing. The works were designed long before the introduction of modern ordnance. Many of them have never been completed, or are falling to pieces for lack of repairs. Some of the earthworks were built in the last century. There are "gun-batteries without guns, and mortar-batteries without mortars. Barbette guns are old smooth-bores, and have no

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

carriages except those which expose the gunners to the enemy's sharp-shooters." Every harbor on the coast may to-day be captured by a small fleet of such vessels as all respectable powers in the world possess, saving only the United States; and we own but the few armor-clads we have recently launched to defend them all.

What have our possible opponents in the way of navies with which to attack us? If we were near at hand, either England, France, Italy, Spain, Germany, or Russia, could throw upon us an irresistible fleet. But there are more than three thousand miles of ocean to traverse, and few war-vessels carry enough coal to be of value after such a cruise. Some, however, do.

Of sufficient endurance to operate from a home station as base, England has 17 battle-ships and 72 cruisers; Italy has 5 battle-ships and 6 cruisers; France, 14 cruisers; Spain, 10 cruisers; Germany, 10 cruisers; Russia, 8 cruisers. Of more limited endurance, such that they would require coal when they reached American waters, England has 30 battle-ships and 99 cruisers; France, 23 battle-ships and 18 cruisers; Spain, 10 cruisers. Here, then, we have 142 armor-clads capable of starting from a European port and of attacking our seaboard cities without re-coaling, and 180 capable of doing so by coaling on this side; a total of 322, all of them "ships of recent construction and of great power" reports the Policy Board of the navy. In addition to these there are many excellent armor-clads which were built before 1870, or which are not of the highest grade of efficiency, and other new and more efficient vessels are being constantly built.

All the vessels of any one nation could not leave home at the same time, but those having the requisite endurance might do so. The question of ammunition, of which no vessel carries a supply for long service and which must be replenished, is serious. And there is the question of seaworthiness. While all these vessels are built to go to sea, there is no pretence that the battle-ships are seaworthy in the sense that a modern passenger-steamer is. Storms might entail disaster. Moreover, big guns are apt to burst, or to break their carriages, or to tear them loose, and a comparatively small number of shots measures the life of most big guns. No European power is anxious to put its precious craft at risk for any advantage to be probably gained over us. They are needed for home purposes. If a vessel is lost, even though indemnity be had, the time taken to build another leaves a gap for a while. Every harbor is more or less difficult to enter in time of peace. In time of war it can be made a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hundred-fold more difficult. The United States are the last nation which any foreign power would care to attack. Herein lies our largest measure of protection. But it is not safe to count on this. If of a dozen battle-ships or cruisers but half succeeded in reaching our shores; if, on an average, each gun was disabled after even five shots, —what would it benefit us if one of our ports had been bombarded before failure, or a heavy ransom had been exacted?

The coal question is the most difficult one. So much of the flotative power of the big vessels is consumed by machinery, armor, guns, turrets, and ammunition, that there is not much left for coal. Hence the latter class of vessels is worthless for attack on our coasts, unless the nation owning them has on this side a coaling-station or an ally with one; or unless they can be coaled at sea (a possible but uncertain process), or can speedily capture a port where they can coal. In this respect the West Indies come into play. But, eliminating altogether this re-coaling class, there remains a formidable and constantly growing fleet able to hold our seas for some time, and to-day, and for years to come, able to enter any and every one of our harbors. With all saving clauses, the mere existence of these armor-clads, which vary between 4,000 and 13,000 tons, is a fruitful source of thought.

What do we need to provide security? First, the navy, of which we now have the nucleus; second, seacoast defences of the very highest order; third, an efficient militia, as a reserve to our small regular army.

That coast defences are first necessary, and a navy next, may be argued. For perfect defence they go together. To place a city beyond risk of capture there needs to be a fourfold line, the outer one of battle-ships; the second of attendant gunboats and cruisers; the next of torpedoes, stationary and movable, and torpedo-boats; the last a line of heavy guns mounted in turrets and casemates, and barbette and mortar batteries, and in some places floating batteries. The navy and coast defences are inseparable, if we would have a perfect system. Which alone is preferable is still a mooted question between army and navy experts.

The Policy Board of the navy, to whom the matter of a fleet has been committed, has laboriously accumulated the most varied information on this subject, and has made a comprehensive plan for a navy. It advises the construction of 92 all-steel armor-clads, viz., 10 battle-ships of 10,000 tons and of great coal endurance, which can steam up to 17 knots an hour, for carrying the war to the enemy's

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

country; 25 battle-ships of limited coal endurance, in three classes of from 6,000 to 8,000 tons, able to steam nearly 16 knots an hour, for the defence of our coast and ports; 24 cruisers of from 4,000 to 7,500 tons, able to steam from 19 to 22 knots, for destroying the enemy's commerce, ravaging or blockading his coasts, scouting for the battle-ships, and protecting our own commercial fleets; 15 torpedo-cruisers of about 900 tons; 5 such cruisers of 1,200 tons, for service in the China and other distant waters; 10 rams proper of 3,500 tons; 3 torpedo and artificer's ships of 5,000 tons, able to steam 20 knots. These are exclusive of 100 first-class torpedo-boats for offensive war, and numerous second-class torpedo-boats such as are carried by battle-ships and cruisers. The largest ordnance on the battle-ships of this fleet will be 13-inch 60-ton guns 35 calibres long; most will be 12-inch 50-ton guns; the cruisers will carry 5 and 8-inch guns.

This will make a worthy fleet—when we get it. Including the vessels already built or appropriated for, the projected United States navy will boast of 120 armored ships of all classes, and 101 torpedo-boats, at a total estimated cost of $350,000,000. Truly a magnificent scheme and a costly. Our first impulse is to cry out at such extravagance. But in the past twenty years "we have wasted in patching old wooden vessels more than enough money to have built and kept in repair 19 ironclads like the British "Inflexible," 11 like the Italian "Lepanto," or 39 cruisers like the "Chicago," nearly half the proposed fleet. These old hulks are worthless, they have merely served their turn in affording employment to voters about election time. If we do not build the proposed armored fleet in whole or in part, how much "repairing" shall we do instead? This is a question of interest to every American.

Such a fleet would put us on a par with any power, and, coupled with coast defences, make us impregnable. Representing us in every harbor in the world, it would, with proper navigation laws, pay for itself in the one item of encouraging and building up our lost merchant marine. A generation ago the most beautiful man-of-war in any given foreign port was apt to float the stars and stripes. May it again be so! But all this is not the work of a day. To do it in the best manner will consume twelve to fifteen years. To do the work at home, we must first place the navy-yards at New York, Boston, Norfolk, and Mare and League Islands in order, and by substantial orders encourage the laying-down of plants for plate-steel and guns by our large iron concerns. Though less time would suffice in case

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

we bought material abroad, it is unquestionably desirable that we build our fleet at home.

This plan meanwhile would give us naval defences only so fast as the new vessels were launched and proven. What should be done in the line of harbor defences? This question has been committed by Congress to the Fortification Board, a body consisting of military and naval experts and distinguished civilians, who reported at great length in 1886.

Though our seaboard is so extensive, but 27 places need coast defence in order to shield it, and this number might be considerably reduced. By defending 11 of them, more than four-fifths of our entire commercial wealth may be protected. From their minor importance most seaboard towns are in no great danger. The high cost of a naval expedition makes a wealthy objective essential. No European fleet is apt to waste time on any but our largest cities, unless for coaling.

In New York both the entrance from the Ocean and the Sound should be fortified by armored revolving turrets, steel-armored casemates, barbette and mortar batteries, submarine mines, and torpedo-boats. This requires 95 guns and 144 mortars, and will cost $8,000,000 for the ordnance, and $14,500,000 for the defences in which to mount them. In San Francisco there should be similar works, with 110 guns and 128 mortars, at a cost of $7,250,000 for the ordnance, and $8,500,000 for the defences. Floating batteries are needed at this point, which will add $10,750,000 to this sum. In Boston 43 guns and 128 mortars will be needed at a cost of $4,000,000 for the ordnance, and $5,750,000 for the works. The limit of the capacity of big guns has probably been reached; 18-inch guns are the largest which will float. Such defences as these, mounted by superior guns, would be good for many years.

The other ports are far less costly to defend. They are, in order of urgency, the lake-cities, Hampton Roads, New Orleans, Philadelphia, Washington, Baltimore, Portland (Me.), Narragansett Bay, Key West, Charleston, Mobile, New London, Savannah, Galveston, Portland (Ore.), Pensacola, Wilmington, San Diego, Portsmouth, Cumberland Sound, the Kennebec, New Bedford, the Penobscot, and New Haven. The total for these ports would be $38,000,000 for guns, and $55,500,000 for works, or a total, including floating batteries, mines, and torpedoes, of $126,500,000. Again a protest against extravagance is in order.

The objections to this plan are its great cost, the time it takes to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

carry out, and the fact that there is no "politics" in it. Is there not a cheaper means or a more speedy one? Yes. Certain works can be more rapidly constructed than others. The quickest way of affording a fair degree of protection to our harbors is by placing in each a well-devised line of mortar-batteries supplemented by torpedoes and mines. These can be made in one-fourth the time required for the same number of horizontal-fire guns in turrets and casemates and at a mere fraction of their cost.

A battery of 16 mortars can be made ready for service, including guns, carriages, and emplacement, for from $8,000 to $10,000 per mortar, according to location. The emplacement of a 12-inch gun costs about $150,000, and the gun and carriage will cost an equal amount. The fire of the recent mortar is not only accurate, but strikes an armor-clad at her most vulnerable point,—the deck. The 12-inch breech-loading mortar of to-day is a fine weapon. Its range is from three to almost six miles; and experiment shows that three out of four shells will hit a large vessel at anchor, and that a big battery will make it very dangerous for a moving vessel whose position is properly signalled. A battery of 16 mortars, each firing six times an hour, will give a shot every 37 seconds. Moreover, these mortar-batteries can be placed where shells from ships which fire only horizontal guns cannot reach them. They are as effective from behind a hill as from any other position. For quick defence the mortar-battery system appears to be the most expedient thing to construct. With sufficient appropriations it would consume but a couple of years to place good mortar-batteries in all our harbors; and these, with an intelligent system of torpedoes and our growing navy, would be of unquestioned benefit. It is an excellent first step. Let the rest, if you will, come more deliberately. But we may not rest content with these. Alone they are not a perfect defence. Mortars are intended to prevent a fleet anchoring at the mouth of a harbor: they are not the equivalent of horizontal-fire guns, which are necessary to destroy it, as rapid-fire guns are required to protect the mine-fields.

Now for the army. This paper is not a plea for a vast increase of our military establishment. The proposed works have to be garrisoned and the guns manned. This, in time of peace, would be done by the regular army. In time of war the service of the coast defences has to be increased. The armies which take the field need increase, large and sudden. This is a more difficult problem. The naval increase comes about naturally. The general public sees the splendid

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cruisers which visit the various ports from time to time, and seems to take a proper pride in them. The old-fashioned love of a man-of-war has not died out among us. And as the navy gets additional ships, additional crews follow as of course. The army can make no such parade. The navy leaps into popular favor. The army is overlooked until it is needed. Coast defences as suggested require a moderately larger artillery force; but this would come about without friction when the defences were done. The addition to cavalry and infantry is not so easily provided. It is not wise to have a large increase, and it is not necessary; but it is of the highest consequence to foster what we have, so to organize the militia that the army may occupy its true place as a nucleus for an effective reserve in time of war. As our militia system stands to-day, it is not to be relied upon. In some States it is fairly good: in most States it is a farce. That it is of higher quality than it was in 1861 is not doubtful. But it is not such that it can be readily called into service in case of need, or be trusted to do serious work at the outset.

Apart from Indian warfare, the *rôle* of a regular army in this country is twofold. In time of peace it should be a model on which a good militia should be patterned. It is an educational body, so to speak. On the outbreak of war, its province is to bear the brunt of the first fighting, until suitable levies of volunteers can be made, or the militia or reserves can be mobilized. By judicious training our militia can be made a reserve from which volunteers can be drawn in sufficient numbers; or, better still, a national reserve can be organized from the militia itself. History has shown often enough, that, unless militia is sufficiently trained and by officers educated to arms, it is inefficient. Our volunteers in the Rebellion were comparatively useless against equally poor troops for more than a year. They became good when they had had the same training as the regulars. Education in the field is as rapid as it is efficient; but it is got at a terrible cost.

Neither of the duties mentioned has our regular army ever been in a position to perform. While, putting aside the "menace" theory, a large standing army in the United States is unessential, such an army as could be represented by companies or regiments in each of the military divisions as a leaven for the militia is in every sense desirable. It has been shown to be so in recent cases where regulars have joined the militia in annual encampments. This opportunity has been too rarely afforded. Our little regular army since the war

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

has indeed been too small to cope with the Indians in the "war of civilization." Give us an army sufficient to detail a regular company as a part of every militia regiment, and the militia would soon be a different body from what it is to-day.

There has been more than one system devised by which our militia can be made an efficient national reserve. Enlist such of the militia as choose to undergo extra drill and discipline; pay this force for time so spent; uniform and arm them. Many of the best of the militiamen would be glad to spend a month every year in regular military training. Of such a force the officers must be appointed by the State; but they could be subjected to an examination as to fitness, and could be given opportunities for study with regular troops at the military schools,—an advantage which would be eagerly embraced. Since the civil war no one doubts the advantage of a military education. If the academy at West Point were doubled in size, so that annually there might be turned back into the population a number of young men trained to arms, their effect upon the militia would be marked. Good officers mean good men: the best of men under poor officers are worthless.

There is to-day something more than 100,000 militia in the several States. It is possible to create out of this a strong and easily mobilized national reserve. But it must be done by men whose profession it is to organize troops. It must not be play. If the task were given by Congress to the army, and sufficient means were provided, two years would show a decided gain. It has been estimated that little more than $3,000,000 a year would be required to carry out an effective plan and to create a national reserve sufficient for our needs.

The danger has been indicated. The speediest means of partial protection as well as the most complete has been shown. How much of this shall be done it is for Congress to decide. *In medio tutissimus ibis:* erect partial coast defences and build a moderate fleet, say most men. If we have too powerful a fleet, we may be led into wars we should otherwise avoid. So far the appropriations for the coast defences have been sadly meagre,—$1,221,000 in 1890, and $750,000 in 1891. To the navy they have been more generous. The building of ships calls on our iron manufacturers, who in their turn influence Congress. Coast defences do not seem to be so popular. A reasonable appropriation—$10,000,000—would erect mortar-batteries and make in each of our harbors a torpedo system which, though partial, can be rapidly erected.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The cost of complete coast defences and a navy, as planned by the Fortification and Policy Boards, is all but $500,000,000. To spread this amount over fifteen years would make necessary an annual appropriation of $33,000,000. Add to this sum $3,000,000 for militia training, and we find that $36,000,000 a year will be needed. There must also be a small appropriation for experiments. The rapid advance of scientific discovery requires constant testing of new devices. But this is not large. We are spending vast sums on pensions, a discreditable percentage of which are unearned or fraudulent. As the pension laws now stand, $140,000,000 will be required for the single year 1891. Is it not wiser to spend something on protection from possible, even if remote, national disaster, than still greater sums on extensions of the pension system? With the defences indicated we should not fear attack, and could hold our own inf oreign complications. It took but a few months during the civil war to spend $500,000,000. Is it not possible, that, without defences, we may be called upon some day to spend even more than their cost on a disastrous war, on indemnities, or on ransoms of cities that some enemy may occupy? In any event, ought not lesser sums to be appropriated at once, to shield our naked harbors?

THEODORE AYRAULT DODGE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A NAVAL MILITIA AND A NAVAL RESERVE.

NATIONAL character is moulded as much by the pleasures of the people as it is by their occupations, and it is a healthy sign to note that with the accumulation of wealth has come the broadening of our type of amusements. The sons of the rich vie to-day with the children of the poorer classes for distinction in athletic sports. The college-boy trains his muscle in the boat's crew, where formerly he lost his money and health at the horse-race; the banker, the lawyer, and the manufacturer spend their dollars upon summer regattas; and the youths upon moderate salaries sail their catboats or canoes.

Yachting, the highest type of pastime, has fortunately, in this country, become the most popular amusement. The struggle with wind and wave braces men's nerves, hardens the sinews, broadens the character, and begets in the citizen a wider national sentiment; the rare sight of the flag upon some coaster bringing to the yachtsman the longing that our ensign should more frequently be seen upon the transatlantic steamer. He meets the government fleet; hospitalities are exchanged; the men-of-war sail away on some diplomatic mission or to some heroic act; and, when the world with which he is surrounded has forgotten a Samoan hurricane or a Brazilian revolution, he remembers the deeds of his acquaintances of cabin or wardroom.

Wherever the yachtsman cruises, the fact is also forced upon him that the seafaring community, be it commercial or naval, lacks concentrated action for its own advancement, and needs a focus in our great ports to obtain recognition, and insure its rights. Thus we find in cities, where critics tell us patriotic sentiment lies dormant, a large body of amateur sailors ready and anxious to foster a renewed sea-power. And while it is true that games with a purpose may become as dreary as the novel with an object, it would seem equally patent, that, if all this tendency to train muscle and nerve to their highest pitch could be turned to actual profit to the country, a desirable end would be reached.

The writer, himself an ex-naval officer, cannot refrain from expressing his surprise that more has not been done to bring the cruising

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

yachtsmen into closer relations with the navy. Every city on our seaboard, every town upon our lakes, has its club and its fleet; the discipline is above the average; the system excellent; the majority of the crews American, and handy with oars and sails; the owners influential, and ready to fraternize and learn from the academy graduates: and yet the navy, prior to the last twelve months, has done little to turn this pastime of the people into the channel of patriotic duty. Several abortive attempts have been made, but have failed, because leading yachtsmen were more intent on obtaining uniform and title for themselves than men and gunners for ships, while the navy was naturally jealous of these cabin-seeking gentlemen, when what it needed was forecastle-hands.

During the last year, however, a great change is noticeable in the relationship between the service and the country at large. Recent naval literature deals less with foreign models for cruisers, and more with methods to Americanize our *personnel*. With the launching of our home-built ships, the wrangles over rank and pay give way to the question of obtaining native crews of a higher standard. The presence of the new squadrons on our coast has resulted in a closer intercourse with the people; and business-men interested in seafaring matters have by their nearer touch with the life of the country lent their aid to dispel certain ill-founded prejudices against the navy. The questions raised between Italy and the United States, growing out of the New Orleans difficulties, have also shown us the need of more efficient coast-defence, and brought home to the entire country the fact, that, if we are ever attacked by a foreign foe, the first blow will come from the ocean, and not from the land.

Coincident with this awakened interest is congressional action tending toward an enlarged navy and a revived merchant marine. Various causes have been given to account for the decline of the latter. One reason is apparent. At the close of the Rebellion, England had made great strides in the art of iron-ship building, while the war had retarded the development of our interior. The resources of the West held out greater inducements, both for gain and adventure, than the sea; and the soldiers from the coast naturally became pioneers beyond the Mississippi, even as many of them had been sailors prior to 1861. The "prairie schooner" replaced the ocean clipper. To-day, the interior peopled, farming overdone, and manufacturers seeking a foreign market, the younger men of the West, as well as of the East, are ready to man our new ships.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

To far-seeing minds, the times are therefore ripe for some organization looking toward the advancement of our ocean-power. While there is no nation which theoretically cares more for its seafaring men than ours, it is doubtful if there is any people that practically has done so little for its sailors. Unlike England, the United States is of continental magnitude; and the citizens of the West, while rivalling the inhabitants of the seaboard in their honor of the navy of the past, are totally ignorant of the details of a man-of-war or the life of its officers and crew. If the army and the militia are mutually helpful, how much more does the navy need an intermediary to keep its record before the people!

What should this intermediary be, and how should it be organized, are questions which are agitating the minds of the lawmakers. Before answering, several points seem settled; namely, that it is the matured policy of the government not to maintain a large navy, and that our seacoast is in a most defenceless condition. It is further apparent that a national militia is not in accordance with the tradition of the country, and that therefore state pride should be evoked to assist the movement. Moreover, the commercial portion of the community is accustomed to see all enterprises developed from small beginnings to large results.

The subject of a naval reserve is practically so new, that any system for bringing it into active life must necessarily be more or less tentative; but none can succeed unless it takes into account the above-mentioned influences.

Recognizing the legitimate demand of the regular officers that a naval reserve should be composed of "deep-sea" sailors, and also keeping in mind the local defence of the various States, we come to the conclusion that the force to be created should be of two distinct parts: 1. A national naval reserve; 2. A state naval militia.

The national reserve should consist: first, of the marine departments of the government service; namely, the Lighthouse Establishment, the Life-saving Crews, the Coast Survey, the Revenue Marine, and the Hospital Bureau,—a force in all about three thousand, but to-day, by a singular financial, amphibious anomaly, under the Treasury Department. Second, of officers and men who have been in the navy, and who owe their country a return for what has been expended upon their education: these should be enrolled subject to call in times of war. Third, of such officers and sailors of the merchant marine as may qualify for positions in case of hostilities. Fourth, of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the new commercial steamers that may meet the requirements of congressional acts.

All the elements to form this body exist to-day. England has shown us how to concentrate them into a compact form under the blue flag of her naval reserve. Her steamship companies expect their officers to accomplish so many hours of drill annually, and make provision for sparing their services for the required time. No excuse will serve us that prevents the use of existing materials and men. Prevention against future hostilities demands equal attention with pensions for the past. There are fewer millions in the former than in the latter, and the attention of Congress should be given to the passage of laws concentrating the various sea departments under a bureau of marine, the power of the Secretary of the Navy being broadened to accomplish this, and to further exercise some authority over such merchant-vessels as may wish to take advantage of government aid.

These forces will constitute a national reserve; but besides this we need a state naval militia. Its necessity would seem to be as apparent as that of the existing national guard. Take, as an example, the port of New York. Its safety is perhaps insured from land attacks; but what protection has it to seaward?

The many easy approaches by water to the wealth of New York City, and the best means of protecting them, have long been favorite themes for military writers of state and national reputation. The accessibility of the city and its suburbs by way of the Lower Bay, the Narrows, Staten Island Sound, and Kill von Kull, and through Long Island Sound and the East River, makes its situation peculiarly exposed to attack by any foreign power. Built on an island, its valuable wharves, warehouses, and shipping depots extend from the Battery to Spuyten Duyvil on the one side, and to Astoria Ferry on the other. The banks of the Harlem River are rapidly being lined with piers and manufactories; while the commercial interests of the sister city, Brooklyn, stretch from Bay Ridge to Whitestone. The schemes for developing Staten Island, and the proposed system of docks from Ellis Island to Robbins Reef, in order to relieve the overcrowded wharves now in use, will present a combined water-front of many miles in extent, that will include millions of property.

In the event of hostilities, the navy proper would be required aboard the cruisers and the battle-ships to so great an extent that volunteers would have to be relied upon to man the movable defences of the port. These defences will be heavily armed ships, which will

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

be the rallying-points for a number of lightly armed, swiftly moving small craft and torpedo-boats. In the early days of smooth-bores and sails, it might have been safe enough to defer action to the season of actual warfare; but now, when steam, electricity, and the telegraph are so greatly perfected, it is more than ever incumbent to make preparations in the time of peace. Here, again, we must not fall into the error that fortifications, or ships, or even torpedoes will insure safety. American water-men, with their strong inventive individuality and native bravery, must be on deck, or at the torpedo-key.

The naval battalions authorized by several of our States, though they may form but a crude *cadre*, little fitted for deep-sea operations, will be composed of elements infinitely superior, for their purposes, to those of the earlier regiments on shore. Yet from these regiments have sprung the fine brigade organizations which occupy the well-equipped armories of the States.

Three objections have been urged against the formation of a state naval militia; first, that the men advocating it are not of the class fitted for foremast-hands or seamen-gunners. The same argument was applied to the land militia at the outbreak of the Rebellion, with what fallacy it is useless here to argue. The discipline, brain, and education of the privates of the national guard permeated the whole of our army, and leavened regiment and corps.

The second objection is based upon the fact that the great advance in the science of naval warfare during the past fifteen years demands a lifetime of study, and that consequently the merchant sailor is more than ever unfitted to become the man-of-warsman, and that the regular officer cannot be replaced by the civilian. This is not altogether true, for side by side with the increased acquirements for the navy has been the fight for kindred perfection on shore. Yachtsmen are commanding steamers of equal speed and size to some of our government vessels; mechanics are handling contrivances similar to gun-carriages; electricians are managing circuits and batteries, and daily inventing new devices for torpedoes, electric lights and power; the employees of private firms are building guns, and thus becoming acquainted with their manipulation; the steamship and railway companies are enforcing a discipline equal to that of the navy, their men being uniformed, and governed by rules as rigid as those of the "Blue Book." Whatever the faults of the large monopolies may be, they are teaching their officials the power to command decisively and promptly large bodies of men. From all these active, pushing, brain-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

working forces, plenty of material is at hand from which to form a militia capable of being a most powerful factor for harbor-defence.

The third objection is an implied hostility on the part of the land militia. It is stated that the national guard has great difficulty in filling its quota and meeting its annual expenses, and that consequently it is inimical to the naval movement. It is to be doubted whether this animosity exists in the intelligent minds of the higher officers. The naval battalions will draw their recruits from forces which cannot be utilized by the regiments. The sailor by instinct or education seldom enlists as a soldier, or, if he does, is sure to return to the sea. The State will thus gain new recruits, who in the school of obedience will learn the power to command. If, unhappily, foreign war should arise or mob-law rule, the present land-troops would have the much-to-be-desired help of men whose life and training fit them for coast and harbor defence.

The recognition given by the general government to the naval militia is an earnest of what may be expected in the future, if advantage be taken of the twenty-five thousand dollars appropriated by the last Congress; and it is to be noted that many of the seaboard States are making preparations to enroll such a body of men. The good results of the manœuvres between the regular navy and the militia during the past summer showed a joint enthusiasm between the regular and the state forces which could not have been foretold. No new corps has ever sprung into such immediate popularity, and this because it was founded on the basis of genuine hard work, and performed its work side by side with the man-of-warsman, whose example it was trying to emulate.

It has been stated that the success of the naval reserve was due to the fact that it was officered by naval academy graduates. That these graduates assisted materially in teaching the recruits the routine of ship-life is undoubtedly true; but the patient devotion to duty and the love of the sea which animated the youths of Boston and New York were the causes of the high commendation received from Admiral Walker and the favorable criticism of the press. The testimony of the governors and of the military authorities is, moreover, to the effect that the naval militia is a valuable addition to the national guard, that it has stimulated the ambition of the latter, and that the recruits have been drawn from sources that otherwise would not have sought the state service.

The government, state, and popular verdict having passed favora-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bly upon the first attempt of the naval militia, it becomes necessary to develop it with the utmost care. Properly begun at the bottom of the ladder, it should gradually work up to a more perfected state organization, from which the higher level of the national reserve may be reached. The government corps will only follow a commonwealth force maturing from legitimate competition. The danger lies at present in too much being expected from the new reserves. They should be developed slowly, kept in close touch with the land-forces, and not allowed to drift away into rival antagonism; and the various States which intend to form a naval militia should act in concert both in regard to the new laws about to be passed by their Legislatures and the resulting forms of organization.

The usefulness of the naval battalion can perhaps be best shown by following its drill from its incipiency to its more perfect development in future years. The *personnel* would probably be composed of the officers and employees of steamship companies, persons who have been in the navy, electricians employed in marine work, tugboat men, yachtsmen, and others whose tastes lead them toward the water. The formation of the battalion would be on the basis that is used in the regular service, the unit being the "gun division." Each of these divisions would be exercised alternately in the varied and interesting drills of a man-of-war. Special attention should be given to marksmanship and sub-calibre practice, while "dummy" great guns and torpedoes could be manipulated as well as more expensive ones.

The battalion as a whole would be handled as naval infantry, the details of which are essentially different from that of the regiment, as it must accommodate itself to the conditions imposed by its dual duties afloat and ashore. As the force grows in efficiency, the character of the education will be widened, the battalion will be merged in the brigade, and simple tactics will be replaced by strategic movements looking toward the safety of the coast-line. The amplification of such movements is impossible in this article; but a statement of the qualifications necessary for brigade commanders and officers may be cited: thorough knowledge of state waterways, lighthouses, buoys, tides, shoals, and proper anchoring places; an intimate acquaintance with the rivers and the smaller streams from which torpedo-boats can operate, and with the railroads which cross the rivers, and their capabilities for carrying torpedo-boats to launching places. A register should be kept at brigade headquarters of tugboats suitable for torpedo-work, as well as a list of shipyards, with their capacity, and the names of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the corporations dealing in coal and other commodities used by men-of-war; the capacity of firms for quick and large delivery should be noted; a thorough acquaintance with the best war and fog signals should be required. Thus the list might be enlarged indefinitely; but enough is given to show the range and duty required by a state naval militia, even if a government vessel cannot always be at hand to supplement local facilities. The Navy Department will, however, always be ready to give a vessel or squadron for a summer cruise; for it is manifest that there is no cheaper way of popularizing the service or defending the coast than by repeating the programme of this year. The general government should also provide the States with some of its unseaworthy vessels for armories, although this is not absolutely necessary, and equally good results could be obtained by having the winter drills in some such building as Castle Garden in New York, a spot eminently fitted by its position for water-front defence and marine exercises.

History has taught us that the nations that have developed their sea-power are the strongest; that the youth of the land where education is broadened on the lines of order, duty, and attention to detail required by military obedience, are most useful for wise command; and in these days of large affairs it is especially needful to train the coming generation intelligently and impartially to control bodies of men with justice to the employer and employed. Corporations are tardily recognizing this fact, while the people at large are demanding officials who shall be trained morally and physically according to a national standard. The countless uniformed societies that now fritter away their time in trivial ceremonial or tinselled decorations should also be brought under the fold of commonwealth or national jurisdiction, and, with the higher types of mind ready to salute the quarter-deck of the ship of state, be enrolled in a civilian force, animated by patriotism, and replete with the enthusiasm of the sailor.

JACOB W. MILLER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ENGLISH ROYALTY.

THE fetichism of loyalty to a sovereign or to a royal family is no more. The right divine of kings to rule is a thing of the past. The fuss and feathers of a court, that once inspired reverential awe, are anachronisms that have outlived their time, and are viewed with contemptuous curiosity by all except professional courtiers and the silliest of the silly. The continental sovereigns maintain their sway by means of their armies, and they are the masters of their subjects. In England the sovereign rules, but does not govern. The Queen of the British Empire remains a monarch, partly because the English dislike change in the abstract, and partly because the system of which she is the figure-head has practical advantages, which, in the opinion of her subjects, counterbalance its theoretical absurdity.

A good deal of stress is often laid on the social advantages of monarchy. They are grossly exaggerated: indeed, it is doubtful whether they exist. The tendency of monarchy is to breed snobism. During the lifetime of the Prince Consort, the sovereign was the social head of the nation, and the tone of the court was beneficial to public morality. But the tone of a court depends upon the character of the monarch. George I., George II., and George III. were three of the most disreputable of human beings in their private lives; and the social influence of their courts was for evil rather than for good. An hereditary arbiter of social morals is indeed a transparent absurdity. Since the Prince Consort died, the court has exercised little social influence, owing to the retired life of the Queen. The court "functions" are limited to drawing-rooms, levees, and occasional state concerts; and at most of them the Queen herself does not appear. At a drawing-room, a number of ancient ladies, young women, and girls, bedecked with feathers on their heads, and with long trains sweeping behind them, pass slowly before the sovereign or the sovereign's representative. At a levee, men, either in uniform or dressed to imitate footmen, do the same thing. What they gain, or what the country gains, by this masquerading, it is impossible for the imagination to conceive. The invitations to state concerts are mainly distributed

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

among the nobility, the *corps diplomatique*, ministers, and a few who have managed to wriggle into the charmed circle without being born in it. But as an appearance at one of these gatherings is a passport to the highest society, it is eagerly sought after. We are, said Napoleon, a nation of shopkeepers; but, as no shopkeeper is allowed to attend even a levee, it is obvious that the vast majority of the inhabitants of this country have nothing to do with these ceremonial festivities, beyond the privilege of paying for them. Now and then the Queen opens Parliament with all the pageantry of royalty, seated in an ornate coach drawn by eight cream-colored horses, and surrounded by Life Guards. The exhibition is attractive to Londoners, who gaze at it as they would at a circus procession. Occasionally the sovereign, or some member of the royal family, makes a semi-state visit to a provincial town on the plea of opening a museum, or laying the foundation-stone of a hospital. At these visitations there is a plentiful display of bunting, and the day is made a local holiday; but there is little enthusiasm among the masses.

Royalty costs, all told, about one million pounds per annum. Until the dethronement of James II., there were certain crown-lands and permanent taxes, the joint produce of which was regarded as a normal income out of which all governmental charges, inclusive of the maintenance of the court, were to be met. As, however, this did not suffice, it was usual to vote additional taxes for the lifetime of each sovereign on his advent to the throne; and these were supplemented by further votes of sums of money, to be levied over a term of years. These crown-lands and the permanent taxes were regarded as the personal estate of the sovereign, and Parliament had no control over the mode in which the moneys derived from them were expended. On William and Mary securing a parliamentary title to the throne, the doctrine that the crown-lands and the permanent taxes belonged to the sovereign disappeared. Their produce was paid into the exchequer, and became in theory, as well as in fact, the property of the nation. At the same time the usage was established to vote the sovereign, at the commencement of his reign, a civil list, out of which he had to meet the cost of his court, to defray all personal expenditure, and to pay certain quasi-public charges which were thrown on him. When William III. sought to make grants of crown-lands to some of his Dutch favorites, this was promptly met by a Resumption Act, in which it was laid down that the title of the nation to these lands was inalienable. During the reigns of Anne, of George I., and of George

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

II., no suggestion was put forward that this property belonged to the sovereign in contradistinction to the state. On George III. coming to the throne, Lord Bute, whom he had selected as his prime-minister, and who wished to make his sovereign the real ruler of the country, inserted in the preamble of the civil list a renunciation for life, on the part of his master, of all the hereditary revenues, in consideration of the life-income settled on him by the act. It need hardly be said that a renunciation dragged into the preamble of an act of Parliament does not create a title. It has been, however, repeated in the civil-service acts of the successors of George III. It does not, however, cover the revenues from the crown-lands situated in the Duchy of Lancaster, over which the sovereign claims a life-interest, derived in some mysterious fashion from John of Gaunt. In the same way the revenues from the Duchy of Cornwall are deemed to belong to the Prince of Wales. Renunciation and retention are, in truth, nothing but a political fraud, intended to create a popular notion that the sovereign has a personal estate, the use of which he gives up, during his lifetime, to the country, in consideration of his civil list being voted, and that consequently monarchy costs the taxpayer nothing.

On the death of William IV., a committee of the House of Commons was appointed to consider what would be a befitting civil list for his successor. Although the renunciation figured in the Civil List Act, no account was taken by the committee of the annual income accruing from the crown-lands and from the hereditary taxes. The amount voted was based upon a careful consideration of what had been the expenditure of William IV. The sum decided upon was £385,000, in addition to which the Queen retained the revenues of the Duchy of Lancaster, amounting then to about £20,000 and now to about £50,000 per annum. The civil list was, moreover, relieved of many of the charges, such as the salaries of diplomatic agents, etc., which had been borne by former sovereigns. The sum total was divided under various headings,—such as "the Lord Chamberlain's Department," "the Lord High Steward's Department,"—and a specific amount was allocated to each of them with the proviso that if, in any year, there was a deficit in any one of them and a surplus in any other, the surplus should go to meet the deficit; but that, if there was a surplus in any one of them and no deficit in any other, then the surplus should be retained in the exchequer. This latter stipulation has, however, remained a dead letter, for there has been no instance during her Majesty's reign of any departmental surplus

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

accruing to the nation. The explanation is, I believe, this: one of the departmental headings is the "Privy Purse," for which £40,000 per annum is allocated, and, by taking care to draw out all moneys before the expiration of the current year, a deficit is created which absorbs the surpluses of the other departments. But, be this as it may, it is admitted that her Majesty's expenditure is less than her income, and it is an undoubted fact that the taxpayer has not profited by it.

The amount of the Queen's civil list in no way represents the cost of royalty. The maintenance of palaces is a most costly item, for it includes not only the palaces inhabited by the sovereign, but a vast number of houses in which she lodges her relatives and friends. One of these houses has actually been given to the Duc de Nemours, a son of Louis Philippe, and one of the wealthiest of the Orleans family. Besides this, there is the building and keeping in repair of royal yachts, and various other such costly items. Incomes, too, are voted to the sons and daughters of the sovereign and to other of her relatives. In addition to the revenues of the Duchy of Cornwall, amounting to about £60,000 per annum, an income of £50,000 per annum has been voted to the Prince of Wales, and of £10,000 per annum to the Princess of Wales. The younger sons of the Queen have been voted incomes of £25,000 per annum, a portion of which devolves upon their wives if they survive them. The daughters of her Majesty have each an income of £6,000 per annum, and in addition to this the Empress Frederick of Germany received a sum of £100,000 on her marriage. The Duke of Cambridge, as a cousin of the Queen, has £12,000 per annum, and his two sisters have severally an income of £5,000 and £3,000 per annum.

A considerable portion of the civil list is expended in salaries to court officials, who change with every change of ministry. Thus the lord-chamberlain receives £2,000; the lord-steward, £2,000; the master of the buck-hounds, £1,700. Seven lords-in-waiting get each £700 per annum for being "in attendance" during a few weeks of the year. The mistress of the robes has £500. Ladies of the bedchamber have each £500. It is difficult to speak with equanimity in regard to so gross an abuse of public moneys. These salaried parasites are pitchforked into these places by the head of the party in power in order to secure the attendance of peers in the House of Lords, or to reward electioneering services on the part of members of that august assembly. The men are persons of no political importance, and the women are the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wives of political nonentities. In some cases the incumbents are possessed of vast private fortunes; in other cases they are comparative paupers, to whom a few hundreds per annum is of such consideration that they are ready to sell their independence as hereditary legislators for it. I have always thought that it is somewhat unfair that moneys expended in buying peers should be credited to the civil list of the sovereign. If the business of the House of Lords can be carried on only by such means, it should be openly avowed, and Parliament should be asked to vote the necessary "Reptile Fund." Whenever it is suggested that members of the House of Commons should be paid, the proposal is denounced, by the party to which the vast majority of these greedy reptiles belong, as something degrading to the dignity of Parliament; and yet these very peers snarl and quarrel over the distinction of highly paid court posts among themselves, whenever their party comes into power, like a pack of hungry curs over some bones that are thrown into their kennel. What would be thought, in the United States, of the Senate, were each incoming President able to distribute salaries to some thirty senators for performing ceremonial duties about his person or about that of his wife? Would the Senate be deemed independent of the Executive, were it possible to give a senator from the North many thousand dollars per annum for walking backward before the President with a white stick, a senator from the South a huge income for looking after the presidential dogs, and the wife of a senator from the West a big salary for presiding over the gowns and the petticoats of Mrs. President? It is often urged by the out-and-out advocates of a monarchical system, that a monarchy is less costly to a nation than a republic, and that in the United States more is expended in political corruption than on royalty with us. This is, of course, an exaggeration, although it certainly does seem to me, that what with your pensions to soldiers of the civil war and to their wives, and other such outlays, there is a good deal of room for financial reform in America. But, be this as it may, America, with its "to the victors the spoils," has not attained the cynical level of openly buying senators by distributing, amongst those of the party that has the majority, a number of sinecures.

The sons and relatives of the sovereign not only receive an annual income from the nation, but they are pushed forward in the public service, and provided with those well-paid berths which are deemed its prizes. Where this is not the case, they are given sinecures from which they derive pleasure or profit. For instance, Windsor Great

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Park and Windsor Forest form a portion of the crown-lands, the revenues of which accrue to the treasury. Prince Christian, a son-in-law of the Queen, is the ranger of the park and forest. Their maintenance costs about £20,000 above what they bring in. Nor is this surprising, as park and forest are huge game-preserves kept up for the ranger and his friends. As an exemplification of "how things are done," the following detail may not be without interest. Accounts are annually presented to Parliament by the commissioners for the crown-lands, but they are seldom read by any one. Looking over them one year, I discovered an item, under the heading "Windsor Park and Forest," of £500 for the food of pheasants. I asked on what ground the taxpayer was debited with an outlay for rearing birds that never came to his table. The answer was, that the country had taken over the crown-lands with all existing charges; that in times gone by certain fields had been sown with buckwheat for the benefit of these pheasants, and that, as these fowl had lost their fields, it was deemed only reasonable to provide them with an indemnity by buying food for them. The minister who gave me this curious explanation plumed himself greatly upon the economy that had been effected since he had been in office, for he assured me, that, under the rule of his predecessors, the pheasants' indemnity for disturbance had always been £1,500 per annum.

An act was recently passed enabling the Queen to make a will, as she was not before this supposed to be the possessor of any property; and the impression prevails that she has effected large savings. This is not the case. Although she has for many years lived in retirement, her expenditure has not materially decreased, for the *mise en scène* of royal pageantry is still kept up. She has expended considerable sums upon the purchase of the estates of Osborne and Balmoral, and their maintenance falls on her. She has, too, made considerable monetary presents to her daughters on their marriages, so that, although she inherited £250,000 from a silly person who left her this amount, her private fortune is comparatively small. Two years ago Lord Salisbury's government submitted to Parliament a proposal to endow her grandchildren. A committee of the House of Commons was appointed to consider this demand, when it was decided that provision ought only to be made for the children of the Prince of Wales. The committee was informed, under a pledge of secrecy, of the total value of her Majesty's investments. As I was a member of the committee, I cannot, of course, violate this pledge; but I do not think

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that I am breaking confidence in saying that the amount was surprisingly small.

The exact financial position of the Prince of Wales is not known. There have been rumors that he is greatly in debt; but I question their correctness. When the prince came of age, he became possessed of the accumulations realized during his minority from the Duchy of Cornwall. A portion of them was expended in the purchase of the Sandringham estate, and the remainder became his. With this nest-egg, with an income of £110,000 per annum, one of £10,000 for his wife, a separate provision for his children, and with Marlborough House kept up for him at the public cost, there seems no reason why his expenditure should outrun his means. His hospitalities are not greater than those of the French President, who, with less than half his income, does not get into debt.

All things considered, our royal family is rather above the average of royal families. The Queen fulfils her political duties with credit to herself. She is naturally a royalist; for, as the Emperor Joseph of Germany said, this is the profession of a monarch. Called early to the throne, she married a man of considerable parts and endowed with a fair share of common sense. Under his guidance, the Queen has held strictly to the Constitution. She can, if she pleases, remonstrate with her minister, should she disagree with any contemplated course of action; but, if the minister stands to his opinion, that opinion prevails. In domestic matters, the Queen, it is believed, has seldom exercised this right of remonstrance: in foreign matters she has done so frequently, and often with effect. The Prince Consort was a German, and he had a strong bias in favor of Germany, which he imparted to the Queen. Whilst an important factor in the foreign policy of the country, on questions of domestic politics she is without influence. This was notably shown in 1881. Lord Beaconsfield was then her prime-minister. This astute and unscrupulous Hebrew had laid himself out to obtain the Queen's favor. On his first admission to her court, it is related of him that he assured her that he owed his success as an orator to a careful study of the Prince Consort's speeches, all of which he had committed to heart; and his entire subsequent intercourse with her was conducted in a like vein of Oriental hyperbole. At the General Election of 1881 he came forward as her candidate; but this, far from being of any benefit to him, materially conduced to the triumph of Mr. Gladstone and the liberals, for the endeavor to drag the Queen into the arena of party politics was strongly resented

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by the electorates. Personally the Queen is popular, and deservedly so. If we are not a more moral nation than others, we like to believe that this is the case, and the high moral standard that the Queen has cultivated is keenly appreciated. I do not think that her popularity has been weakened by the retired life that she has led since the death of her husband. "Society" and fashionable London shopkeepers may complain of this; but they do not constitute the nation. "Familiarity breeds contempt," and I am by no means sure that her rare apparitions have not invested her with a mystery that conduces to respect. She has published several records of her private life. As literary efforts they are not remarkable; but her homely gossip about her joys and her amusements, her stories about the doings of "Bertie" and "Vicky," and her descriptions of her drives and her tea-drinkings on the Highland Hills, have appealed to the domestic chord which vibrates in the British breast. They may not have augmented the sentiment of loyalty to the Queen, but they have popularized the woman. The hold of Louis Philippe over the French *bourgeoisie* was mainly due to his sleeping in the same bed as his wife, and what this marital couch was to him the "Leaves from the Highlands" have been to the Queen. The popularity of the Prince of Wales is of a different kind. Nature has endowed him, as it did Charles II., with great tact. Like that monarch, in his relations with the all sorts and conditions of men and women with whom he is brought in contact, he always says the right thing, and says it in a hearty and cheery way, as though its utterance were a pleasure. He presides over charity dinners, lays foundation-stones, sits through scientific oratory, opens bazaars, and dances at balls with unflagging zeal. He is eclectic in his surroundings. A few years ago he devoted himself greatly to American girls, as their exotic independence and freedom from conventionality pleased him. They have now been put aside, and he has developed a curious taste for vulgar and ostentatious *parvenus* of doubtful antecedents and nondescript nationality. This has caused heart-burnings amongst those who deem that they ought by right of birth to be his associates; but it is a matter of absolute indifference to others. A few months ago he figured in a court of law as a baccarat player where cheating had been suspected; and when it came out that he himself had provided the counters with which the game was played, he was lectured and prayed for by the "unco gude," although I confess that I failed to see the difference between playing at baccarat and keeping race-horses. The general feeling was, that it

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

might be well for him so to arrange his amusements as to manage to keep out of the law courts; but his popularity has not permanently suffered from this episode. The other children of the Queen lead quiet and decorous lives. The least popular is the Duke of Edinburgh; for although very rich, owing to his marriage with the daughter of the Emperor of Russia, his parsimony is the reverse of princely. Some of the Queen's daughters have married German princes. Their husbands are harmless nonentities, and if they are disliked it is mainly because, not being Englishmen, they live at the expense of Englishmen.

I have entered fully into the financial arrangements connected with royalty, because in them lies the danger to the monarchy. Almost universal suffrage has placed power in the hands of those not largely endowed with this world's goods. Royalty exercises no glamour over them. They fail to understand why the sovereign should have so vast an income from the public exchequer, and still less why the relatives of the sovereign should be so handsomely provided for from the same source. It is probable that before long there will be a general overhauling of the salaries of our ministers, our judges, our ambassadors, and of all other highly paid officials, for the amount which they receive is far too great. During the reign of Queen Victoria the civil list and its contingent arrangements will not be touched; but if, on the demise of the Queen, a Tory majority seeks to perpetuate this state of things, royalty will receive a rude shock. If, on the other hand, the sovereign becomes the hereditary figure-head of the nation with a salary such as that at the disposal of President Carnot; and if the silly ceremonial of a court, with its lord-chamberlains, its master of the buck-hounds, its lords-in-waiting, and its ladies-in-waiting, with its genuflections and mediæval servility, is swept away,—I see no reason why the monarchy should not endure for many a year. The mass of Englishmen are neither monarchical nor republican. The monarchy represents an existing state of things, rather than a principle, in their eyes. Its strength is in its weakness. A monarch openly immoral would not be tolerated; nor would a monarch who were to endeavor to secure to himself a reality of power. The tenure of every English sovereign to the crown will be dependent on good behavior: to put it more correctly, on an avoidance of notoriously bad behavior.

A monarchy such as ours is not without its advantages. When the first place in a state is vacant, many seek to occupy it. In

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

order to succeed, a person must be endowed with intelligence above the average, with great pertinacity, and with much ambitious energy. These qualities do not disappear when his aim is achieved. He is not prepared to become a mere puppet, and to limit himself to ceremonial duties. He has views that he desires should prevail, and he is impatient of control. If he be elected for life, or for a fixed number of years, he may find himself in conflict with the sense of the majority; and this conflict between the actual opinion of the moment as represented by the majority, and a past phase of opinion as represented by himself, may lead to friction. The question between a President elected for a term of years, as in America, and a puppet Sovereign such as ours, is, whether it is better that the Executive should be independent of the Legislature, or whether it should emanate directly from the Legislature, and be a part and parcel of it. With us, all laws and proclamations run in the name of the Queen; but this is nothing beyond an empty form. Power resides with the prime-minister. He becomes minister because he is the leader of the party that has a majority in the House of Commons. So soon as he loses that majority, he vacates his office. He is termed the "servant of the Queen;" but in reality he is the "servant of the people," holding office at their good pleasure. When appointed, it is officially announced that the Sovereign has "been pleased to appoint;" whereas it most frequently happens that the monarch never did a thing more personally displeasing. It will perhaps be said that the experience of America shows that an elected President does not necessarily lead to complications. But is not this to a great extent due to the fact that the government of Washington is tempered by the governments of the States forming the American Union? If there were no State governments, difficulties would probably have arisen before now, notwithstanding the efforts of the framers of the American Constitution to avoid them. If the people of a nation are really to be their own masters, a puppet Sovereign is unquestionably more conducive to this result than an elected President possessed of active individuality, even when the executive functions, as in America, are divided between the President and a Senate. The British Empire is made up of the parent state and of a number of colonies, most of which are practically independent of the mother-country. The tie that unites all these component parts is very slight: it is little more than that all are nominal subjects of the same sovereign. It is an abstraction, but a useful abstraction, and it is difficult to see how it could be replaced with ad-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

vantage, although, like most other human institutions, it has its disadvantages. The monarchy is consequently accepted by the vast majority of Englishmen without any strong enthusiasm for it, but without any desire to put an end to it. The onward march of democracy will sweep away the House of Lords and the Established Church; it will concentrate power, even more than is now the case, in the House of Commons; whilst, by the payment of the members of that House, it will convert it from an assembly of plutocrats into one more directly in harmony with the people.

But the monarchy is likely to survive these changes. Its abolition is not within the area of practical politics, nor will it be so long as those who have at heart its continuance are wise in their generation. The monarchy has devoted adherents amongst the upper classes on account of its social aspect; the middle classes like it because they have a notion that it is respectable; the artisans and the agricultural laborers have grievances that touch them more closely, and a change from a monarchy to a republic would not so directly benefit them as the removal of these grievances. At Radical gatherings, whilst I have never observed any ardent desire to sing "God Save the Queen," I have never heard any desire expressed to substitute a republic for our present system. Were a parliamentary candidate to address an electoral meeting on the advantages of a republic, he would be deemed a tilter at a windmill, and he would be requested to favor his hearers with his views upon more practical and more immediate issues.

H. LABOUCHERE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE INCREASE OF GAMBLING AND ITS FORMS.

WHENEVER, for any reason, public attention is sharply drawn to gambling, as it was a little while ago in England and as it periodically is in the United States, half of the community is shocked at the apparent prevalence of gambling; while the other half wonders that these periodical commotions subside so quickly, and with so little result. Meanwhile there has not been published, within thirty years, any comprehensive review of the gambling "industry," fortified by even approximately accurate statistics. To give some definite idea of the extent of the gambling habit, and a partial insight into its multiform methods, is my purpose in this paper, leaving to others the discussion of its intrinsic morality, and the suggestion of preventives and remedies—if there be preventives and remedies.

Gambling has had many definitions, but the most accurate one is "the desire to get something for nothing"—"the wish to make money without working for it." To most men money seems the one thing needful; all their energy is centred on its acquisition, and they naturally prefer to gain it by easy methods rather than by daily toil. A few individuals may gamble to drown sorrow, because their associates do, or to employ idle time; but ninety-nine out of every hundred gamble for the purpose of winning, and for no other purpose.

In ordinary parlance the word "gambler" means a person whose avowed profession is gambling, but this restriction of its meaning is illogical. The faro-dealer could not gamble unless his patrons gambled with him; the lottery-owner could not gamble unless his customers also gambled by buying his tickets; and the "book-maker" could not gamble unless the public gambled by accepting his odds. A logical classification would include as gamblers those on both sides of the table—the faro-punter and the faro-dealer, the buyer and the seller of the lottery-tickets, the pool-purchaser and the pool-vender, the broker and the "lamb." Be this as it may, in this paper the word "gambler" is used to mean a man who gambles. Another distinction must be made. There are faro-dealers who cheat as frequently and as meanly as do some grocers or milkmen; "book-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

makers" who default as do bank-cashiers; there are cheating roulette-wheels, just as there are fraudulent insurance companies; swindlers in lotteries as well as in stocks. The men guilty of these practices are not gamblers, but robbers, and I shall use the word "gamblers" to mean men who gamble, but who do not cheat or steal.

There are four classes of men who do not gamble: first, those who conscientiously believe that gambling is wrong, and who refrain on account of that belief; second, those who, not personally averse to speculation, fear that their social or business standing might be hurt by such indulgence; third, those who are so poor that they are unable to gamble even to the extent of buying a two-cent policy slip; and fourth, that class of men who have short pedigrees, whose blood is deficient in red corpuscles, who dare not risk their money on a fair hazard, who, if they were speculators, would be swindlers also, and who, if they were driven to a choice, would rather be thieves than gamblers. Take from the adult male population of the world these four classes, and the rest gamble in one way or another, and most of them habitually and persistently.

It is safe to say that there never was a time in the history of the world when gambling was so rife among all classes of people as at present. In fact, many legitimate branches of business are tinged with the hue of speculation. Those persons who do not bet on horse-races or in stocks gratify their speculative tendencies by dabbling in rural town lots, in mining shares, and in various other so-called business enterprises whose methods are really variations of the roulette-wheel, with twenty "eagle-birds" instead of one. The styles of gambling change from age to age. A hundred years ago gentlemen staked their money on various games with cards or dice, and most extraordinary wagers were sometimes made on these games, whose popularity did not depend upon their intrinsic charm, but upon the fact that men of a speculative turn of mind could find no other convenient hazard. The same class of men who, in the last century, wagered thousands and hundreds of thousands on the turn of a card, or on the emptying of a dice-box, now speculate in the stock, produce, or cotton exchanges, and on horse-racing, which is at present the greatest of all gambling games.

That betting is both heavier and more widespread than ever before is proved by its literature. A few years ago there were in the United States but four or five newspapers devoted wholly to sports, and these were all weekly or monthly publications. Now there are forty

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

weeklies and one daily. Ten years ago ordinary daily journals gave little space to racing, and less to betting. Now all the prominent newspapers give full details of the pool and book-betting, and dozens of them, some with reputations for sanctimoniousness if not for sanctity, not only publish conspicuously the conditions and entries of the several races of the afternoon, but employ experts to announce every morning their opinions as to the probable winners, which are intended to serve as a guide to bettors in investing their money. So important do the editors consider this feature of their publications, that, whenever their prophets succeed in naming a majority of the winners, the editorial pages call especial attention to this fact as a reason why the public should purchase journals that are likely to assist their readers in winning their bets. In England similar facts are noticeable. Thirty years ago there were in that country but two sporting papers, each weekly. Now there are forty, several of which are published daily. The department of these journals upon which the managers expend the most brains and the most money is the reporting all the details of the daily work of the horses and the odds quoted against them, which would tend to guide their readers in betting: and these same newspapers publish columns of advertisements from "tipsters," who profess to have exclusive intelligence about probable winners, which they offer to sell for a consideration.

That the men of to-day have a stronger tendency to gamble than their ancestors had is shown, too, by the character of their favorite games. When our forefathers bet on whist, roulette, hazard, or *écarté*, they had before their eyes a fascinating game, interesting in itself, and attractive independently of its financial results. But, when the modern gambler speculates in stocks or wheat, the game on which he wagers is out of sight, intangible, and of no possible interest save as a means of winning or of losing money. Indeed, many branches of modern business are founded on gambling and supported by it. Nine-tenths of the business of the stock exchange is gambling pure and simple. The actual purchase of stocks and bonds for the purpose of investment is a legitimate business. "Puts" and "calls," "options" and "privileges," purchases and sales on margin, are gambling and nothing but gambling. Eliminate from the business of the stock exchange all gambling transactions, and grass would soon grow in Wall Street. Buying grain or provisions for consumption, for milling, or for foreign shipment, is a legitimate business. "Puts" and "calls," purchases and sales of wheat, corn, and pork on margin, are pure

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gambling. There have been weeks when the sales of certain kinds of grain and provisions on the exchanges of Chicago and New York exceeded the total amount of these commodities existing in the world; and on Monday, August 17, 1891, the sales of wheat on the floor of the New York Produce Exchange exceeded 21,000,000 bushels, while the total visible supply of wheat in the United States on the same day was officially reported as 19,556,682 bushels—almost a million and a half bushels less than the amount sold in one room in New York City between 9 A.M. and 3 P.M. of that day. By no twist of language can these alleged sales of property, which not only was not owned by the sellers, but which in fact did not exist, be called legitimate business.

The United States, too, is the garden-spot of gambling. We gamble more universally, more persistently, and for higher stakes, than the people of any other country; and the reason for this pre-eminence is easily found. In older countries social and business life runs in deeper grooves. The rich are richer, the poor poorer. A man is a shoemaker or a carpenter because his father or his grandfather was. Men are born, live, and die in the same grade of society. Money is scarcer, wages are lower, expenses are less, and a man's earning capacity is less. Men have less money to speculate with and the established routine of their lives offers little chance for outside ventures. In the United States the conditions are different. The barriers between the different classes of society are so low that any one can step over them. The poor boy of to-day may in a few years become a merchant, next a millionnaire, and then a senator. The opportunities for money-making are many and varied. The tone of business is speculative. A large proportion of the population have spare money to use as they wish, and most of them invest some or all of it in some species of gambling.

Gambling is, of course, the only element in many games of chance and in speculation by margins on the various exchanges; but betting is also the life-blood of other sports. Horse-racing has been said to be "the king of sports and the sport of kings," and it is usually represented to be a business promoted for the highest objects—intended mainly to improve the breed of horses and to develop the extreme possibilities of their speed. Yet, when the supporting hand of gambling is withdrawn from the race-track, ruin follows speedily. If betting, public and private, could be in any manner totally suppressed, horse-racing would become a tradition. Only this season the Monmouth Park Racing Association, one of the oldest, richest, and most

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

famous in the world, was forced to abandon its magnificent property in Monmouth County, New Jersey, and to transfer its racing to another State, because some old and recently-resurrected laws of New Jersey made the stewards of the track personally responsible as criminals if they allowed gambling upon their premises. In New York what is known as the Ives Act legalizes betting within the enclosures of race-tracks from May 15 to October 15 of each year, limiting it to thirty days on any single track. Under this law there is racing on from one to four tracks every day from May to October, but the most successful meeting is brought to a close as soon as its thirty-day period of legalized betting has expired; and no matter how pleasant the weather, how many the horses, and how favorable the circumstances, no track opens before May 15, or keeps open after October 15, simply because it would be impossible to maintain these tracks without gambling. The financial exhibit is approximately as follows: from fifty to one hundred "book-makers" pay to the proprietors of the course $100 each for betting privileges, and this sum of $5,000 or $10,000 pays the expenses and provides the purses for the races. If betting were abolished, the only source of income would be the gate receipts, but people will not attend horse-races unless they are permitted to bet; and, if there were no betting, there would be no spectators. Clearly, therefore, the "sport of kings" is directly dependent upon betting.

Moreover, during the past few years, betting on horse-racing has greatly increased on account of the dulness which has prevailed in the stock, produce, cotton, and other exchanges. Statistics would show that every year just about the same amount of money is risked in gambling or speculation of all kinds, but, when for any reason the tide ebbs away from Wall Street or Bowling Green, it flows with equal strength to Sheepshead Bay or Morris Park. Men who have the money and like to gamble will gamble, and if one game is not attainable they will find another. In Europe, where horse-racing is not so prevalent, nor so thoroughly systematized as in America, the result is seen in the increased amount of money wagered on games of chance at clubs, and in the enormous gambling at Monte Carlo and other resorts, whose chief attractions are the gaming tables. In Australia, where the betting on horse-racing is still more extravagant than in England or America, single bets of $20,000 or of $30,000 are frequently recorded, $50,000 to $500 has been wagered several times, and bets of $500,000 to $5,000 have been once or twice made against double events or combinations.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is quite probable that there are just now no men who gamble quite so heavily, except in stocks, as did the "plungers" in the early part of this century. There were in England a dozen men who made $250,000 "books" on the Derby alone, and as late as 1856 a "book-maker" bet $500,000 to $5,000 against each of three horses in one race. In 1843 the owner of the Derby favorite "backed" him publicly to win $750,000, besides the amount of his private bets. The ring of "book-makers" paid to one circle of bettors a million dollars when "Lecturer" won the Cesarewitch. The owner of more than one Derby winner collected $500,000 on the next settling day, and in several other years owners would have pocketed a million if their colts had been "first past the post." Most men who now have the money and the "nerve" to make such enormous bets have given up horse-racing in favor of a game which has still higher possibilities, and instead of wagering $500,000 on a horse and calling it gambling, they deposit the same amount as "margin" in a stock speculation and call it business. Although individuals do not lay such heavy wagers as were sometimes made by the "plungers" of old, much more money is wagered now than was risked fifty years ago. The difference is, that while then one man bet $100,000, now ten men each bet $20,000, and the total amount wagered is doubled. Of single bets made on American horse-races the following instances are taken from the records: Haughton bet Walton $14,000 to $1,000 against "Giroflé;" Haughton bet Kelly $20,000 to $5,000 against "Henlopen;" Appleby and Johnson bet P. Lorillard $11,000 to $10,000 against "Pizarro," and $25,000 to $5,000 against "Leo" in the same race. In each of these cases it is probable that the owners risked ten times these amounts on each of the races, as the bets above stated were only those made with one "book-maker."

There are in England less gigantic operations by "book-makers" than in old days, but every considerable town has several betting clubs, in which bets are made on every conceivable hazard. The number of these clubs in Liverpool, Manchester, Birmingham, London, and other of the large cities, is not definitely known, but the correct figures would be astonishing. Formerly the head-quarters of betting were at London, all the large "book-makers" were there, and persons residing elsewhere who wished to bet were compelled to do their business with the London men, either by mail or through agents. Now every large town has its "book-makers" and betting is made easy. In America betting-clubs are almost unknown, but in their place we have

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the pool-rooms, which do the same work by different methods, and provide the same facilities; so that in either country, men who wish to bet have no lack of convenient opportunities.

No one knows the number of so-called "bucket-shops" and "pool-rooms" in the United States, and it is probable that the correct statistics will never be obtainable unless the business should be fully legalized; but their number, and the daily aggregate of their transactions if it could be correctly computed, would be most extraordinary. Only last week a daily newspaper of New York City published an article on the present plethora of racing, in which the most prominent pool-room keeper in the city was quoted as saying that in the pool-rooms of New York alone, during the present season, the public was a million dollars ahead of the room-keepers. It is probable that this is a typographical error, and that what he really said was that the room-keepers are a million dollars ahead of the public; but the fact that so large an amount was named shows the immensity of the transactions. Certainly the amount wagered every year on American horse-racing almost surpasses belief. In the fifty or sixty pool-rooms in New York City alone, the betting reaches a total of about $150,000 per day. During the winter about $300,000 a day are wagered at what are known as the "winter tracks." At the great race-meetings, such as Brooklyn, Morris Park, Coney Island, and Monmouth Park, about $200,000 are wagered daily, and on days when important stakes are decided the betting exceeds $500,000. On some of the "historic" days these amounts are trebled. At one race-track on a Saturday afternoon last summer there were ninety "book-makers" betting an average of $2,000 on each of eight races, making a total sum of about $1,440,000 wagered on this one race-track in one afternoon. Add to this the amounts bet on the same races in the pool-rooms of different cities, and, it is probable that more than $2,000,000 changed hands by the decisions of this one afternoon's racing on one track. These statistics are for the vicinity of the city of New York alone. Add to this the pool-rooms in all the larger cities in the United States, the great race-meetings on Chicago's three tracks, at Saratoga, at Louisville, at Latonia, at New Orleans, at Memphis, at Kansas City, and elsewhere, and it will be seen that the betting in the United States on horse-racing alone probably exceeds an average of $500,000 per day, or a total of nearly $200,000,000 a year. This "business," by the way, gives employment to a hundred thousand men; and some of its details are astonishing. The sums paid annually by

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"book-makers" and pool-sellers for the privilege of betting stalls on the 1,000 race and trotting parks of the United States amount to more than $2,500,000. Add to this the clerk hire and telegraph service at the race track, and also the rent, clerk hire, telegraph service, and indirect taxation paid by the keepers of betting rooms in cities and towns, and we have a total of more than $5,000,000 annual expenses of betting upon horse racing and trotting in the United States. This amount, increased by the annual profits of the legion of "book-makers" and pool-sellers, represents the net amount lost by those persons who speculate in this manner.

Trotting is a sport second only to racing in the magnitude of its gambling interests, and far ahead of racing in its general popularity and widespread distribution over the country. For every racing meeting there are a dozen trotting meetings; and these, like the racing meetings, could not exist without betting, and do not exist in those localities where betting is forbidden. The pool-seller and his tin box are as essential to the success of a trotting meeting as are the track and the horses, and wherever local legislation has forbidden public gambling, trotting meetings are abandoned. It is impossible to obtain accurate statistics of the amount of money wagered in America every year on trotting meetings; but when it is considered that there are more than one thousand such meetings every season; that their average duration is four days, with three races each day; that every one of these races is contested in "heats," varying in number from three to fifteen, with a probable average of six; and that it is not uncommon to hear of there being $40,000 or $50,000 in the pool-box on one race, a mathematician could make a tolerably close calculation of the enormous amounts of money annually wagered upon trotting.

In several of the United States, and in almost all European countries, lotteries are legalized and are very popular. Notwithstanding the laws against selling lottery-tickets in New York City, there are a hundred offices where they can be bought, and five hundred men earn their living by peddling them throughout the city. If by some miraculous power every man in New York City could be stopped at noon to-morrow, and his pockets searched for lottery-tickets, the number of them and the high character of their owners would astonish the community. Lotteries are drawn daily in New Orleans and Kentucky, and tickets for these daily drawings, commonly known as "policy slips," are sold in every considerable city in the Union. The monthly drawings of the Havana lottery interest persons throughout

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the United States and South America. The German Anti-Slavery lottery at its next drawing offers prizes valued at $250,000, and at the next drawing thereafter, it offers prizes worth over $500,000.

The managers of the more important leagues of the national game, base-ball, have done everything in their power to suppress gambling; and open betting on base-ball is not allowed at any of the games of the better class. But throughout the country, more especially in the West, the pool-rooms make a feature of base-ball, and those who desire to speculate can bet any afternoon on the result of every game, on the result of every "inning," on the runs made by each club, and on the combinations of the various games.

Of what are called regular gambling games, faro, the king of all, and when honestly played the fairest "banking" game in the world, has its thousands of votaries. Roulette, whose percentage is many times as strong against the player, has also its tribe of followers, attracted by the very stupid fallacy that it must be a better game because, for certain kinds of bets, it pays thirty-five for one, while faro only pays one for one. These speculators forget the fact that their chance of winning the greater odds is less even than it should equitably be.

It would seem that, with Wall Street and Bowling Green, with horse-racing and horse-trotting, with pool-rooms and faro-banks, enough methods are afforded to all who desire to gamble, and that speculation would be confined within these more prominent channels, but such a belief is far from the truth. Americans bet and bet freely on everything that involves a contest or admits of a wager. Hundreds of thousands of dollars are won and lost every year on the aristocratic sport of pigeon-shooting. Money changes hands every night in all the metropolitan bowling alleys; heavy wagers are made on all important yacht-races; bicyclists "back" themselves and their friends liberally. Even those sports on which the controlling authorities have discouraged or forbidden public gambling do not escape, and at almost every regatta of the National Amateur Rowing Association pools are sold in public halls and hotels before and during the races, while private betting on all amateur regattas reaches extraordinary proportions. Public betting on amateur athletic sports has been allowed in America in one or two instances only, but it is quite common in England, and will perhaps become prevalent here in the near future. Meanwhile every important championship race or match between noted athletes is attended by liberal private betting. The

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

passengers on steamships, temporarily cut off from their habitual recreation, gamble with cards from morn till morn again, make pools on the daily run of the ship or on the hour of arrival, and sometimes bet thousands of dollars on whether the next vessel will be sighted on the port or on the starboard bow. Men gratify their taste for gambling in ways large and ways small. On the same street in any city may be found men of comparatively equal wealth and standing, some of whom "play" the stock exchange, others the race-track, others the faro-table, and still others the weekly or the monthly lottery-ticket. Some of them gamble in still smaller ways. There are in every large city hundreds of business men and clerks who habitually meet at luncheon in parties of three or four and at the conclusion of the meal throw dice, sometimes for the luncheons, and sometimes only for the after-dinner cigars. This style of speculation is comparatively harmless, and it is probable that each of the party will have paid at the end of the year just about the same sum as if he had every day paid his own bill; but the practice clearly illustrates the craving for speculation which afflicts even our serious business men. Much of the gambling formerly done in public club-houses has been transferred to private residences, and there are in all large cities and even in smaller towns many dwellings whose owners sit down in the parlor once or twice a week to play poker or baccarat with their intimate friends. Thus, on account of the divergence into new channels of what may be called the speculative turn of men, gambling at card and dice-games in clubs and regular gambling-houses has become less during the past decade. The devotees of faro and roulette, of baccarat and *écarté* and poker, now frequent the race-track, the pool-room, or the exchanges, to the neglect of their old-time sports. At the various public and private gambling-clubs, too, throughout the country there is less "high play" than of old, although a few veteran devotees still play cribbage or *écarté* for amounts which quicken the pulse of younger men. With the decay of betting in regular gambling-houses the houses themselves have decayed. Some are shut up, some have been transformed into stores and residences, and others are dragging out a precarious existence, with starvation peeping in at the key-hole. Their proprietors have fared as badly as the houses. Some are beggars, some are working for their board and lodging, many are "book-makers," one or two keep hotels or restaurants, and a few have "diced with death," and lost.

Although the prime motive of gambling is gain, keen observers of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

speculation notice that avarice is not always the controlling spirit, and the majority of losers feel less keenly the loss of money than the discredit of their judgment, or their lack of skill. It is also noticeable that in games like stock-speculation or lottery, where there is no possibility of skill, and the result depends exclusively on chance, losses and winnings are accepted philosophically, while at whist or other games which combine a minimum of chance with a maximum of skill, intense interest is shown about small financial results. There is an authentic instance, which occurred a few years ago, of a speculator of world-wide reputation, who was "carrying on margin" 11,000,000 bushels of grain, which declined in value $25,000 during the afternoon, and who did not bother himself even to read the quotations, but gave his entire attention for four hours to a game of whist at dollar points, and was much out of temper at its close because of a loss of nine dollars.

When students of human nature have leisure they might profitably investigate the peculiar effects of gambling upon the character of the gambler. The boast of the average business man is that his word is as good as his bond, and his bond is as good as a treasury note; yet these business men, worth millions of dollars and of unquestioned probity, have in purely financial matters no higher standing than gamblers whose acquaintance they would scorn. If an ordinary business man lends a thousand dollars to his neighbor he takes a note with one or more indorsers, and many of these notes are before maturity peddled through brokers' offices at a discount. If a professional gambler, out of business, out of money, and with his jewelry pawned, sees an opportunity to start a club-house or to open a profitable "book," he can, if his previous reputation in such matters be good, borrow $5,000 for what is called his "bank-roll," giving no note, no indorsers, and no stated time of payment, but having simply a verbal understanding with the lender that the money shall be used solely for the purpose indicated, and that it shall be repaid as soon as the game wins. Gamblers worth perhaps $10,000 will sit down to a faro-table, lose the $500 they have in their pocket, and borrow from their opponents the whole $10,000 which they are known to possess, with no guaranty for its repayment excepting their word; and, if the whole amount be lost, the losers will haste next morning to collect all their funds and pay the debt at the appointed hour, even if the act reduces them to poverty. The men who are the borrowers in these transactions, although so scrupulously honest in such dealings,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are perhaps worse than "doubtful" in other matters, and would lend themselves cheerfully to schemes of fraud or even of theft. But between themselves, in cases covered by the gambler's code of honor, their honesty is as sturdy as that of men of the highest character in any branch of business.

Gambling is reprehensible, but the spirit that underlies it is noble. A genuine gambler is a great man gone wrong, and gambling is a misdirection of courage and energy and enterprise—of all those attributes that make man most manly.

The same mental qualities that enable a man to await without a tremor the turn of a card that carries his fortune, or the stock quotation that may make him a beggar, will lead him to face death unflinchingly at the call of glory, of honor, or of duty; will bring him first over the breast-works when a forlorn hope saves the army; and will nerve him to risk his life for others at the throttle, in the surf, amid flame and smoke, or in a hospital.

Gambling "runs a close race" with intemperance for the dishonor of being man's greatest curse; but it cannot be legislated away, or punished out of existence, because human laws and human punishments do not change human nature. It will probably never be totally eradicated, but it might be greatly lessened and its greater evils abated if the intelligence and enterprise and restlessness in which it has its root could be guided into other and nobler channels. When legislators and moral reformers appreciate this fact, and shape their action accordingly, they may do more than simply to change the habit from one direction to another.

W. B. Curtis.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WRITERS AND SUBJECTS IN THE OCTOBER FORUM.

An English Estimate of Lowell. ARCHDEACON F. W. FARRAR.—Lowell as patriot, teacher, critic, orator, and poet. The merits and defects of his poetry; how by his poems only he is likely to be remembered.

The Venerable Frederic William Farrar, Archdeacon of Westminster, was born in Bombay, India, in 1831, and was educated at Cambridge. He won reputation first as a poet and writer of fiction, then as a philologist, before he became a theological writer. His "Life of Christ" (1874) is said to be the most popular English theological book of this century. He is the author also of "The Life and Works of St. Paul" and of "The Early Days of Christianity." Archdeacon Farrar has written much also for magazines, encyclopædias, and commentaries, and he has lectured and preached extensively in the United States.

One Remedy for Municipal Misgovernment. PRESIDENT CHARLES W. ELIOT.—The failure of our political methods when applied to municipal government by reason of the recent development of our municipal problems, which require special knowledge of science; the remedy, the permanent employment of well-paid experts.

President Charles William Eliot was born in Boston, Mass., March 20, 1834, was graduated at Harvard in 1853, and after serving as tutor became professor of chemistry there. In 1865 he accepted the same chair in the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and in 1869 he was chosen president of Harvard. President Eliot is a frequent public speaker and an occasional contributor to current literature.

Social Verse. ALGERNON CHARLES SWINBURNE.—A review of "*Lyra Elegantiarum*,"—an anthology of English social verse by Frederick Locker-Lampson,—with critical estimates of most of the English verse-writers for occasion, at all periods of our literature.

Mr. Algernon Charles Swinburne, the English poet and essayist, was born in Pimlico in 1837, and was educated at Oxford. In 1865 he published "Atalanta in Calydon," a tragedy on the Greek model. Since that time he has written copiously both in verse and in prose. Among his chief poems are, "Songs before Sunrise;" "Chastelard," a tragedy; "Tristram of Lyonesse;" "A Midsummer Holiday and Other Poems;" and "Marino Faliero," a tragedy. His critical works include, "Under the Microscope," "Essays and Studies," "A Study of Shakespeare," and "A Study of Victor Hugo."

A Plan for a Permanent Bank System. THE HON. MICHAEL D. HARTER.—A proposal to continue the present national banks and to permit the establishment of state banks, with carefully chosen state, municipal, and railway bonds as security, in place of United States bonds; an explanation of the plan in detail; how it would have worked for the past twenty-five years; how it would provide for a properly elastic currency, and have a salutary effect on the management of bonds eligible to this securityship.

Mr. Michael D. Harter, who was born at Canton, O., in 1846, is a resident of Mansfield, O., and a Democratic member of Congress. Mr. Harter has had long experience as a private banker, as a manufacturer, and as a man of large business affairs; and this plan is the result of many years' practical study of the subject. He is a vigorous opponent of a protective tariff, as well as of the free coinage of silver.

The "Bennett Law" in Wisconsin. SENATOR WILLIAM F. VILAS.—An explanation of the part played in the last election in Wisconsin by the school controversy; the effort to have State supervision of private schools; the teaching of German in the public schools and the question of religious control; subsequent legislative enactments; misapprehensions of the controversy corrected.

Senator William Freeman Vilas was born in Chelsea, Vt., July 9, 1840, whence his parents removed to Wisconsin while he was a child. He was graduated at the State University of Wisconsin in 1858, and he chose the law as his profession. He rose to the rank of colonel in the civil war. He was a member of the Legislature in 1884, and chairman of the Democratic National Convention in the same year; and, during President Cleveland's administration, he was successively postmaster-general and secretary of the interior. By the last Legislature he was elected United States senator.

The School Controversy in Illinois. E. M. WINSTON.—An explanation of the controversy and contest at the polls in Illinois; an argument for State control and for the compulsory teaching of the English language—from a Republican point of view.

Mr. E. M. Winston was born in Mount Morris, Ill., September 21, 1862. He was graduated at Harvard in 1884, and since 1888 he has been a member of the Chicago bar.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Real Meaning of the Free Coinage Agitation. EDWARD ATKINSON.—Why the free coinage of silver, if the legal-tender acts were repealed, would be harmless; the obscure and probably dishonest origin of legal-tender laws; an explanation of coinage; why no law can change the real value of a metal; for what purpose the free coinage agitation is kept up.

MR. EDWARD ATKINSON, one of our most voluminous and most widely read writers on a broad range of economic topics, was born in Brookline, Mass., February 10, 1827. He is president of the Boston Manufacturers' Mutual Fire Insurance Company, which wrought a revolution in the construction and security of manufacturing buildings; and he is the inventor of the "Aladdin Oven." His numerous works include, besides others, "The Collection of Revenue," "The Railroads of the United States," "The Railway and the Farmer," and "The Distribution of Profits."

Increase of Crime by "Reformatory" Prisons. WILLIAM P. ANDREWS.—The startling increase of the number of prisoners, especially in Massachusetts, since the substitution of the modern reformatory for the punitive method of treatment; evidence from the personal observation of the writer.

MR. WILLIAM PAGE ANDREWS was born in Framingham, Mass., November 22, 1848. He was educated in Salem, where he has always resided, and since 1870 has been clerk of the criminal court there. He has edited the poems of Jones Very and Charles T. Brooks, and has written a good deal for periodical literature on literary and economic subjects.

Agricultural Depression and Waste of Time. PRESIDENT DAVID S. JORDAN.—Evidence that one cause at least of the farmer's bad plight is lack of industry; the eternal law that prosperity comes only by labor.

PRESIDENT DAVID STARR JORDAN was born at Gainesville, N. Y., January 19, 1851; he was graduated at Cornell University in 1872, and at the Indiana Medical College in 1875. In 1879 he became professor of biology in the Indiana University, of which he was subsequently chosen president. He resigned in 1890 to accept the presidency of the newly founded Leland Stanford, Jun., University, in California. He has written much on natural history, and is the author of a "Manual of the Vertebrates of the Northern United States" (1876).

The Needs of our Army and Navy. COL. THEODORE A. DODGE.—Our carelessness of military preparation throughout our whole history as proof that we are the least warlike of nations; our extravagance in refusing to save the cost of wars—much of the cost at least—by not preparing for them; our present meagre army; what we should make of it; the navy and coast defences.

COL. THEODORE AYRAULT DODGE was born in Pittsfield, Mass., May 28, 1842. He received a military education at Berlin under Gen. Von Frohreich, was graduated at University College, London, in 1861, and entered the American regular army as a private, rising to the rank of captain and brevet-colonel, and he retired in 1870. He has written much on military subjects, his works including, "A Bird's-Eye View of the Civil War," "A Chat in the Saddle," and "Military Studies of Alexander the Great and Hannibal."

A Naval Militia and Reserve. LIEUT.-COMMANDER JACOB W. MILLER.—How we might turn our love of aquatic sports to patriotic use; a naval militia; need also of a national naval reserve; a plan of organization and a statement of benefits.

MR. JACOB W. MILLER, formerly an officer in the navy, is now lieutenant-commander of the Naval Reserve Artillery, State of New York.

English Royalty. HENRY LABOUCHERE.—What the monarchy costs the English tax-payers, and how they regard it; its perpetuation dependent on good behavior; ridicule of the House of Lords.

MR. LABOUCHERE was born in Surrey, Eng., in 1831, and entered the diplomatic service in 1857, but retired in 1864 and entered political life as a Radical. He has sat in Parliament most of the time since that year, and has also won fame as a journalist, becoming part proprietor of the London "Daily News" in 1868, and serving as an editorial writer on the "World" after 1874. In 1877 he established "Truth," which he still conducts. In the House of Commons Mr. Labouchere's powers of satire have made him conspicuous. He is a pronounced Radical, and has several times proposed the abolition of the House of Lords. His best known book is his "Letters of a Besieged Resident in Paris," first published in the "Daily News." He wrote for the FORUM "Democracy in England" (January, 1890).

The Increase of Gambling and its Forms.—W. B. CURTIS, managing editor of "The Spirit of the Times." A plain statement of the prevalence of gambling in the United States; the increase of the varieties of its methods and of the number of its devotees; a calculation of the sums of money wagered on racing and other forms of gambling.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOK LIST.

HISTORY, BIOGRAPHY, TRAVEL, AND ESSAYS.

BOHM-BAWERK, EUGEN V. The Positive Theory of Capital. Translated, with a Preface and Analysis, by William Smart, M.A. Macmillan & Co. $4.00.

CODRINGTON, R. H., D.D. The Melanesians: Studies in their Anthropology and Folk-Lore. With illustrations. Macmillan & Co. $4.00.

COTES, V. CECIL. Two Girls on a Barge. D. Appleton & Co. Cloth.

DOWIE, MÉNIE MURIEL. A Girl in the Karpathians. Cassell Publishing Co. Cloth.

HANNAY, DAVID. Rodney. (English Men of Action Series.) Macmillan & Co. 60 cents.

HOSMER, JAMES K. A Short History of German Literature. Revised edition. Charles Scribner's Sons. Cloth. $2.00.

MOIR, JANE F. A Lady's Letters from Central Africa, a Journal from Mandala, Shire Highlands, to Ujiji, Lake Tanganyika, and back. With an Introduction by Rev. T. M. Lindsay, D.D. Macmillan & Co.

MORLEY, HENRY. English Writers: an Attempt toward a History of English Literature. Vol. VII. From Caxton to Coverdale. Cassell & Co. Cloth.

POUTON, MUNGO, F.R.S.E. Earthquakes in Ancient and Modern Times: their History, Phenomena, and Probable Causes. Thomas Nelson & Sons. Cloth. 80 cents.

SAINT-AMAND, IMBERT DE. Marie Antoinette at the Tuileries, 1789-91. Translated by Elizabeth Gilbert Martin. With portrait. Charles Scribner's Sons. Cloth. $1.25.

SANBORN, F. B. Dr. S. G. Howe, the Philanthropist. With portrait. Funk & Wagnalls. Cloth. $1.50.

SIDGWICK, HENRY. The Elements of Politics. Macmillan & Co. $4.00.

WEISMANN, DR. AUGUST. Essays upon Heredity and Kindred Biological Problems. Vol. I. Edited by Edward B. Poulton, Selmar Schoenland, and Arthur E. Shipley. Authorized translation. Second edition. Macmillan & Co. $2.00.

WILSON, SIR DANIEL. The Right Hand: Left-Handedness. (Nature Series.) Macmillan & Co. $1.25.

WULLING, FREDERICK J., Ph.G. The Evolution of Botany. D. Appleton & Co. Paper. 10 cents.

POETRY.

HAYES, ALFRED. The March of Man, and Other Poems. Macmillan & Co. $1.25.

HOWITT, MARY. Birds and Flowers. Thomas Nelson & Sons. Cloth. $1.00.

TENNYSON, ALFRED, LORD. Enoch Arden. With Introduction and Notes by W. T. Webb, M.A. Macmillan & Co. 40 cents.

FICTION.

KIPLING, RUDYARD. Life's Handicap: being Stories of Mine Own People. Macmillan & Co. $1.00.

VAN ZILE, EDWARD S. Don Miguel, and Other Stories. Cassell Publishing Co. Paper. 50 cents.

WHITBY, BEATRICE. On the Lake of Lucerne, and Other Stories. D. Appleton & Co. Boards.

EDUCATIONAL.

EMTAGE, W. T. A., M.A. An Introduction to the Mathematical Theory of Electricity and Magnetism. Macmillan & Co. $1.90.

GOSS, JOHN, A.M. Forensic Eloquence: a Treatise on the Theory and Practice of Oratory. The S. Carson Co. Cloth.

MAYHEW, A. L., M.A. Synopsis of Old English Phonology: being a Systematic Account of Old English Vowels and Consonants, and their Correspondences in the Cognate Languages. Macmillan & Co. $2.25.

PALGRAVE, R. H. INGLIS, F.R.S. (editor). Dictionary of Political Economy. First part. Abatement-Bede. Macmillan & Co. $1.00.

SEELYE, JULIUS H. Duty: a Book for Schools. Ginn & Co.

WENDELL, BARRETT. English Composition. Eight Lectures given at the Lowell Institute. Charles Scribner's Sons. Cloth. $1.50.

RELIGIOUS.

GLOVER, REV. RICHARD, M.A. Winsome Christianity. Thomas Nelson & Sons. Cloth. 60 cents.

MILLER, J. R., D.D. Making the Most of Life. Thomas Y. Crowell & Co. Cloth. $1.00.

MISCELLANEOUS.

BURKE, EDMUND. Speeches on the American War, and Letter to the Sheriffs of Bristol. With Introduction and Notes by A. J. George, A.M. D. C. Heath & Co. Cloth.

MARTIN, ANNIE. Home Life on an Ostrich Farm. D. Appleton & Co. Cloth.

SWEETSER, M. F. King's Handbook of the United States. Edited by Moses King. With illustrations and colored maps. Moses King Corporation. Cloth.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED